



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



THE PRESENT A RELIGIOUS CRISIS.

CHURCH REFORM.

"Those things which artful men conceal"

"Are here engrav'd with pen of steel"

"By Conscience, that impartial scribe;"

"Whose honest palm disdains a bribe."

CONVOCATION—Against the revival of.

PLURALITIES AND SINECURES—Reply to the Bishop of London's Defence of.

MARRIAGE—In favour of equality of all Sects in respect of.

REGISTRATION—A branch of civil Government, impertinent to a Christian Ministry.

CHURCH RATES—Against the Commutation, and in favour of the Abolition of: with an Appeal to the Rev. H. J. Rose, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and author of a Sermon, "*Christians the Light of the World*;" and other matter connected with Church Rates.

THE UNIVERSITIES—In favour of the admission of Dissenters to.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS—Against the removal of the Bishops from.—Pro's and Con's from the new Poor Law Bill.

BY THE

REV. EDWARD DUNCOMBE, M. A.

(Of Brasenose College, Oxford,)

RECTOR OF NEWTON-KYME, YORKSHIRE.

LONDON :

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY.

1835.

(Price One Shilling.)

14.

TO THE
FRIENDS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD,
THIS ADDRESS
IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED IN CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP,
BY THEIR OBEDIENT SERVANT,
THE AUTHOR.



YORK:
Thomas Wilson and Sons, High-Ousegate.

ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS.

“Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, &c.”—*James*, i. 25, 26.

“So speak ye and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty.”—*James*, ii. 12.

IMMEDIATELY upon the dismissal of the late ministry, and before the final appointment of their successors, an appeal to the PROTESTANTS of these kingdoms appeared in several of the public newspapers. Never having seen or heard any disclaimer of this “*Letter*,” on the part of Lord Kenyon whose signature it bore, I might consider myself justified in at once concluding that his lordship is the author of it: but as there are many to whose judgement it seems to have emanated from the spirit of exultation and triumph, rather than from any pure desire to promote more general pacification and unity—as it appears to myself an act tending rather to endanger than to secure the success of that party whose interests it was doubtlessly intended to serve, I hesitate to leave my own vindication too positively to his lordship: I prefer to say, IF Lord Kenyon is the individual who wrote that Letter, because he felt conscientiously persuaded in his own mind that the present is A RELIGIOUS CRISIS, I may THEN fearlessly consent to regard “THE CRISIS” in the same light: no High-Church lash can reach to chastise me for so doing without first lapping round his lordship: and from reformers I have nothing to fear, as their universal maxim is to extract the honey of counsel,

and to leave to other refiners the comb. Fellow-Christians, I ask your attention to the following pages, at a moment not of excitement, but when it is probable that the calm will succeed the storm,—when it is hoped that, by Divine disposing, if not as a natural effect of an evident cause, the public mind diseased, wearied, and intoxicated as it has been by political surfeiting, consequent upon a general election, may now welcome a little simple food, and evince a disposition to “*let its moderation be known unto men.*” With this hope and to this end, I offer you the following Address *in defence and furtherance of reform on Christian principles.* The Letter, alluded to, was addressed to PROTESTANTS; I address mine to CHRISTIANS; I point out the distinction to suggest the reason. A person may be a PROTESTANT, and yet fall far short of being altogether “*a Christian.*” For “*the works of the flesh are manifest * * * hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, envyings, murders.*” * Now a man may pass among us as a Protestant, whose vision is still obscured by carnal mindedness, who is dead while he liveth, whose spirit is dyed in these sources of blood. But “*the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace,*

* “*Murders.*”

Offend whom it may, I am not careful to have to answer them for saying, that I regard the use of the sword, in collecting tithes, so long as justice is denied to the people of Ireland, and the Established Protestant Church unreformed, as contrary to Christianity. Whoever is ashamed to confess the weightier matters of the law, judgement, mercy, and truth, is not worthy of the name of Christian minister.—A starving and unemployed people,—neglected poor, and non-resident landlords,—Catholic fury, and Protestant infatuation.—All can see, who can wonder when national indignation follows such ungodly misrule? Let JUSTICE be done: Catholics will recognize her features, and their obligations as well as we Protestants: so long as it is withheld, be the prime minister whom he may, so long shall I for one exclaim, not only “*when will Ephraim cease to envy Judah,*” but also “*when will Judah cease to vex Ephraim?*”

“long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” Does *Protestantism* necessarily produce *this fruit*? Does our government exhibit and bring forth this fruit in Ireland? I leave the proof of this to Lord Kenyon, or any who are enterprising enough to attempt it; “*he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly.*” If we are verily and indeed Christians, “*if we live in the Spirit let us walk in the spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another.*” It shall be my endeavour to maintain this spirit while I seek to serve “*the strong meat of the word,*” the meat of Christian Principles to all who will become my guests. I offer it to the public ungarnished and undisguised; and if by chance its appearance or taste may not exactly please the palate of epicurean critics, I will at least take care that it shall be in the power of no one to object to its want of plainness: still less to condemn it as measured out in partiality to any man or set of men in particular. Upon all matters and measures involving religious principles, it behoves us to “*speak out,*” to be “*no respecters of persons:*” and as no man can serve two masters, as “*the servant of the Lord shall prosper,*” let us shew ourselves not so much Protestants, as Christians, “*seeking first the kingdom of God,*” confident in the promise that “*all other things shall follow after.*” There are ecclesiastical and religious as well as secular and civil politics: to the former I confine my pen, and I publish my opinions, not because I think them better than any which others can form, but because, “*as there is a way which seemeth right to a man but the end thereof is death,*” we may all help each other to weed out that which is wild, to propagate in its stead that which is sweet: because in the hands of those who desire only

improvement, even the failures of the weak are capable of ministering strength to the fallible. Let us begin with the consideration of subjects, on which few observations suffice.

First, as to THE REVIVAL OF CONVOCATION. It has ever hitherto been a matter of considerable doubt to me whether this revival would be to the advantage and edification even of the clergy themselves; I have always suspected that those who advocate it are only seeking to erect a stage for the exhibition of their own mountebank opinions and religion, to the great disgust and annoyance of all sensible spectators. But it may be asked of me "Who made thee a judge in this matter?" I confess my arrogance and incompetency. I refer my reader to far better authority. Let any one read "*Certain Letters,*" by *L. S. E.* which the Bishop of London has selected for recommendation to his Clergy, out of all modern publications—Let him then pursue his studies by perusing "*Speeches, &c. delivered at the Meeting of the Clergy held at Liversedge, on the 15th of August, 1834, &c. Rivingtons:*" he will then perhaps be better qualified than I am to judge of the observation which I copy from a most forcible article in the "*British Critic,*" (No. xxxiii. page 221.) on "*Extremes in Religion.*"—"As to restoring the Convocation, the strongest argument against any such attempt, is the possible intrusion of such men as Mr. Gathercole; and the tumult and uproar of which they would make it the stage."

Let us proceed to PLURALITIES, NON-RESIDENCE, and SINECURES. On these subjects I have not now to make known my objection to friends, or I may add to enemies, who honour me with their antipathies as a Church Reformer.

I therefore say no more here against their existence, than what may serve to show a fallacy in the

Bishop of London's opinion; a fallacy which being found in "A Charge to his Clergy, July, 1834," (since published,) I may justly say amounts to *an error of doctrine*. The Bishop says, "*Pluralities are a legacy which we inherited from the papal dominion:*" (page 21) what, I ask, has this to do with their continuance? Is John at liberty to rob Paul, because Peter set him the example? I defy the Bishop of London to defend by Scripture the position he has now taken up regarding pluralities. His lordship goes on to say, "*their continuance was necessary,*" &c. What? has not his lordship (page 19) proclaimed them "*wrong in principle?*" Have they not for centuries been deprecated as "*evils?*" What then enjoineth St. Paul, "ABHOR *that which is evil, cleave to that which is good.*" If they are *evil*, if they are "*wrong in principle,*" and I rejoice to have AT LAST Dr. Blomfield's assent to this truth, then to defend their continuance in the past is to make EXPEDIENCY the first rule, and THE LEADING PRINCIPLE—it is to say, "I am tempted of God"—it is to say, *that we may do evil that good may come*. Is this Scripture doctrine? Dr. Blomfield is not surely enlisted under the banners of predestination to sin: I write boldly as on a point of doctrine I ought to write—I serve but one Master, even Christ the Lord; "*though it must needs be that offences come, yet woe unto him by whom they come.*" Pluralities may be "*enticing,*" men, laity, and bishops, may vote them profitable: but "*the rich man fadeth away in his ways:*" as *the flower of the grass he shall pass away*. "*Blessed is the man that endureth temptation. Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man. But EVERY MAN IS TEMPTED WHEN HE IS DRAWN AWAY OF HIS OWN LUST, AND ENTICED.*" (James, ch. i.) That which is "*evil,*" that

which is "WRONG IN PRINCIPLE," never is, never will be "NECESSARY." and whosoever he be, prince or subject, pope or *bishop*, who asserts the contrary, asserts that which he cannot justify.

Before taking my last farewell of *pluralities*, and their unsightly cousins *sinecures*, let me say a few words to parry the misconception that any reformer wishes to see their abolition effected by injustice. If present tenants are foolish enough to say, "*we only desire to retain our advantages as doing God service*;" then, indeed I think government in kindness to these blind men, should apply its strength to open their eyes—charity, Christian charity demands it of them. But except in such cases, existing interests are held sacred by reformers. To hurl men to penury and want, is like the present starvation of curates: it is a part of *the old leaven*, which we would not, to gain the world, borrow from *the infallibles*. We want to see no children suffering for the sins of their fathers: and we appeal always to the Parable of the Tares in our vindication: but we do want (and withhold it whoever can) a new system for beginners. We leave to punishment by public opinion the young men who have hurried to be in time to catch hold of the skirts of nepotism: we wish them no severer rod; she has already scourged the backs of many till they have disgorged their prey, and before long the SINECURIST and PLURALIST will not find themselves more dignified in society than the cheated curate, and the working vicar: and I am much mistaken in her power, if she does yet entail some blushes on those who have written against "*reform in the proper sense of the term*." *

* See "*a Charge*" by Archdeacon Thorpe, Rector of Ryton, Prebendary of Durham, &c., published at the request of the Durham clergy, of course on account of its *objections to reform*, in 1832. How, after the publication of these

Reformers do not object to the continuance of evils till the time of harvest? No: I speak now but for myself; let reformers disown me if they like. What I object to in the Bishop of London's Charge is, that he still clings to his old principle. I do not say, let reformers on this account reject church reform or any other reform: God forbid.—But I do say, let reformers in accepting it make it plainly understood, that *they have demanded it on very opposite principles to those on which his lordship concedes it.* They owe this to their own characters, they owe it to the country; it is their only basis for success in case the cause of reform should ever be replaced in their own hands. Let them take what they can get; but repudiate the principle of conceding merely to public opinion, or sacrificing for popular favour. Reform has been demanded in the name of JUSTICE; and in her name alone let it be received. To proclaim a branch and as matters have long endured, a most important branch of church government "*wrong in principle,*" one page, and in another, to *resume its defence* is a leaf out of the "*Diruens, ædificans*"—the blowing hot and cold—or according to modern phraseology, "*the here, there, and no where*" school, partaking, I think, more of the wisdom of the children of this world, than of the wisdom of the children of light. In speaking thus boldly, it may be thought by others that I shall incur the anger of Dr. Blomfield. I have not, and am very unlikely ever to have the honour of his lordship's acquaintance; but it is quite enough without any other agency to forbid fear on my

objections, the Venerable Archdeacon and his enterprising band of followers can with any credit to themselves or without injury to the church, desert from *regulation*, to serve in 1835 under Sir R. Peel, who professes himself to have always been what he now promises to prove, a *Church Reformer in the proper sense of the word*, we shall see. I watch the progress of the *regulators* with no common interest.

part, that the Bishop of London has desired the publication of Mr. Rose's exhortation to the clergy to speak "*truth always and at all hazards*:" and if I indulged any anticipation at all, or troubled myself to count the cost of my present warfare, I really believe that I could persuade myself that I should be doing Dr. Blomfield no more than justice in thinking, that so far from feeling either anger or contempt for my observations, he will feel some secret prepossession for one who prefers to make open straightforward charges to anonymous insinuations or "*words of dubious import*." Be this however as it may :

"Is't thought my visions are too grave?

"'Tis proof I'm no designing knave.

"Perhaps, if interest held the scales,

"I had devised quite different tales."

As to **SINECURES** : I rejoice in the confident anticipation that reform on this point is now inevitable : even those who a short time ago reprobated interference with these, as "*revolutionary in tendency as well as in principle*," * will now (I expect) find it, (I forbear to shew *convenient*, but) *conservative*, to admit its necessity, and advocate its application. So much for consistency : I congratulate all proselytes to the cause of reform upon their conversion ; I should have credited their sincerity and respected their judgement more if they had not been so free in abusing those who were of quicker perception than themselves, if they had evinced a little less questionable "*kindly feeling*," a little more decided "*honesty*," a little more unequivocal "*Christian charity*" towards those who were not so slow and backward as themselves in coming to the light, that public abuses might be reproved and corrected. If no one however feels more animosity or ill-will towards opponents in the past than

* Archdeacon Thorpe's words against Lord Henley, in 1832.

I do, there is more hoped for from their conduct in the future than regretted in the past.

“For every wrong that stimulates the breast
“Becomes a source of pleasure when redrest.”

I wish not any one to blush for their conversion from error, but for their opposition to reform, or for delay in lending their influence and NEW CONSERVATISM to turn our SINECURE revenues to some better account than hitherto:—whether it be by increasing the incomes of those benefices, whence great tithes are taken away to the injury of the Churches concerned—or by devoting some of our Cathedral revenues to the establishment of schools of Theology, as hinted at by the Bishop of Exeter in his Charge in 1833, for the reception and preparation of future clergymen—or by any other application which may enlarge the utility and increase the efficiency of our Church Establishment. *Where there is a will, there is a way.* I only add my hope that the Bishop of London will take care that his opinion is impressed upon the king and his council as forcibly as it was upon his clergy. THE PEOPLE, said his lordship in his Charge, (page 13,) “*The people are not adequately supplied with the means and opportunities of Christian instruction, and Christian worship. We want more Churches, and more clergy-men.*”—(page 15.) “*I do not intend to say that the Church possesses no resources at all within itself, from which that deficiency may be, in part at least, supplied.*”

Let us now proceed to subjects of more general interest : subjects such as these already under notice command little attention beyond the pale of the Established Church. We will now, therefore, enter upon questions affecting Dissenters

as well as Churchmen, and may all ponder them according to the importance of the changes to which they refer.

MARRIAGE.

I shall not attempt to make proselytes to my own opinions on marriage. Whether it is regarded as a religious ceremony, or only as a social compact, to which the parties interested call God to witness their assent.—Whether others agree with me in regarding it as a divine institution, for the increase of the human race, and for the comfort of man, for whom “*it is not good to be alone;*” and as a counsel to persons of strong passions, whereby they may regulate and control the same—or whether they deem it as nothing more than the signing, sealing, and delivering any other bond involving no sacred principles in its formation, is of no moment to the point at issue. All persons agree that the contract, when once ratified, is binding, according to the terms in which it is drawn up: all persons recognize a breach of it, as a violation of honesty, a wilful breach of promise which they have voluntarily made—as a transgression of a law, to which they have subscribed, and since *the strength of sin is the law*, I need hardly add, *in all cases*, as a sin before God. “*By their own words they shall be justified, and by their own words they shall be condemned.*” Proceeding now from these premises, the prevention of the marriage of all Dissenters according to their respective forms, seems to me “*A grievance of them, which ought to be redressed.*” It is however a very simple question: and I submit my opinion that you may derive benefit from its weakness or its value. Laying aside the prudence of marriage in a religious point of view, common sense alone dictates the necessity and propriety in our mere social relation, of requiring that some form or ceremony should be gone through, in order to legalize and publish the contract, and extend to children the

distinctions and privileges of legitimacy : every one knows that the laws of primogeniture, as established in this country, have contributed to the permanency and tradition of property, and the glory and prosperity of the nation and its best institutions, as directly as a different system in France has tended to the desertion of the country, and the congregation of the wealthy in towns, and to the consequent neglect, poverty, and degradation, of the people on estates and lands, in which too many have a share, for any one to take an interest or feel a responsibility.—Every body knows how sometimes the children of the poorest, of those who eke out a miserable pittance by the sweat of their brow, prove by some reverse of circumstances, heirs of the richest :—every body knows that nothing would be a greater act of injustice and impolicy, than to throw down the barriers, which separate bastards from children born in wedlock. With this knowledge, it remains for you, reader, to form your own judgment on the simple question before you. For my own part, since some non-conforming communities already enjoy the privilege of using their own form, I can see no reason against, and many in favour of, *granting in respect of marriage equality to all sects*. I cannot see what violation of our constitution in Church and State it would be : I cannot but think that party and prejudice give far more strength to objections raised against such reform, than any religious scruples, any Christian principles, or any professed friendship to the Established Church : and, I hope that all pledged votaries to things as they are will possess themselves in patience, if ever they read, that I think it perfectly compatible with my holding preferment in the Establishment, to esteem some parts of *our own marriage service* capable of vast improvement. The practice of curtailing the service is now so common and so authorised, that its length as ordered by

the Rubric, is of secondary importance: but not so, such words without meaning, which we cannot avoid "*teaching*" to the man, as "*with my body I thee worship.*" If these are not words without meaning, they are words disgusting to the most ordinary delicacy, or repulsive to the most indifferent religious feeling: for it is written, "*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God: and him only shalt thou serve.*"

Consequent upon marriage there is another step, which a wise government will always render necessary to obtain its recognition of the legitimacy of children. I mean

REGISTRATION,

On which, since it is classed, as at present arranged, among the grievances of Dissenters, THE NEW ADMINISTRATION will doubtlessly follow up REFORM: and on which, therefore, I will say a few words, though any alteration on this point by no means appears to me to involve religious principles, or to be a cause of anxiety and care to Dissenters more than to Churchmen. As to the notion that the clergy are opposed to such reform, it is far too absurd to deserve refutation: the victims of such prejudice merit nothing but pity. It may, however, perhaps help to soften those asperities, which delay of such politic reform has occasioned, to ask the enemies of the clergy to consider how different our present national circumstances are to those which existed when the present system of registration was deemed the best. The Established Church then comprised, what it is now unable to accommodate, a far greater proportion of our population; it was then, comparatively speaking, easy and natural both to the parents and to the clergy to have all the events recorded in the parish register. But now things are different; and when to this change we add the consideration, that as population and property

have increased, the demand for entries, and the necessity for accuracy have increased also, none but the most ultra-bigots to old customs can defend the perpetuation of a system so prejudicial, as the present, to the end which it was originally adopted to further. To meet the exigencies of our times,—and for these it is the first duty of the passing generation to provide ;—we want simply a registration of *births, marriages, and deaths, without any regard to the circumstances of baptism and burial* ; without any distinction exclusive of those who prefer a *different form from the Established Church*. Registration is a civil regulation, auxiliary to civil government ; and men who say—“ we cannot devise a measure to suit all cases,”—seem to me to confess themselves disqualified to have any voice in the administration of public affairs ; they proclaim themselves men who make difficulties where they find none.

I beg your forgiveness, reader, if I have offended by this digression on a subject like registration, involving in my judgement no doctrinal principles ; the best and only apology I can make is, that seeing it is not our business, I dislike its close connection under the present system with the Church Establishment, and consequently seek to propagate a desire to ease the church of it, as impertinent to it. The next subject on which I desire *at this “ religious crisis”* publicly, plainly, and boldly to record my opinion as a minister of the Established Church is,

CHURCH RATES.

Now, my fellow-Christians, have you ever turned your mind to consider with impartiality the demand and payment of these on Christian principles ? If not, better to do so late than never—if you have, you will not object to my taking my present step in consequence of having imitated your good example. Now, first, AS TO THE PAY-

MENT of church rates BY DISSENTERS. If any man can say, that he is doing God a service, that he is only "FULFILLING ALL RIGHTEOUSNESS" in resisting or withholding the payment of church rates, while they are legally required and demanded, such a man appears to me deficient in sanity either of mind or of conscience. Does he class church rates among "*the things which be God's ?*" let him pay them to Cæsar as "*the minister of God to him for good.*" "*Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.*" There is nothing in circumstances to annul this law: let us give the scrupulous Dissenters every advantage: suppose we the clergy are "*robbers of the poor.*" suppose, as a member of the Society of Friends regards, and in discharge of his "*public duty,*"* and as "*a servant of God,*"* has publicly proclaimed us, (Oh! the deceitfulness of the human heart! alas, such zeal not according to knowledge! !) suppose *we, the clergy,* do "*form a dark eclipse between God and men's souls,*"* what then? the law continues "*the same yesterday, to-day, and for*

* These representations are borrowed from a popular "History of Priestcraft," by William Howitt, which so far from thinking, as many do an injury to the church, and a disservice to pure religion, I regard as a highly useful and seasonable work, as communicating to the public the principles of the Birmingham Association of Dissenters, and at once relieving us from rash confidence in Quakers, which we now are plainly informed is partially (God forbid that any of us should believe it generally) groundless. "*Trust not to their outward man!*" are the very words of W. Howitt. Is deception "*the product of public duty?*" With all due deference to the venerable antagonist of Mr. Howitt, Archdeacon Wilkin's zeal overcame his discretion when he admitted the said charges against us as open to refutation. I am persuaded to hope better things of and for Mr. Howitt: "*the ungodly are a sword of the Lord,*" and when our impure excrescences are cut off, Providence will sheath that sword: at least so I pray and so I believe. I hope that the Archdeacon will not think of trying to convert me to his views on Church Reform.

ever." I use the following Scripture as conveying neither more nor less than is intended in the original: it is spoken in favour of obedience to men who "*devour widow's houses, and for pretence make long prayers, &c.*" "*The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, THAT observe and do: but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not.*" I apply this here in the full readiness to meet the angry feelings of opponents: modern Separatists will perhaps be ready, indignantly to exclaim like the Pharisees of old, "*are we blind also?*" "are not we Dissenters quite as qualified to judge in this matter as the king, the parliament, or the clergy?" Their sin is the consequence of their qualification and ability, which no one denies: and whether Mr. Howitt, and his co-representatives of dissent are on the light or dark side of "*the eclipsing clergy,*" the Scriptures are equally intended for their correction, and reproof, and instruction, as for the use of the church; and, God Almighty grant that we may all in our several stations inwardly digest them; God grant that the ascendant church may emit a brighter and a clearer light, as the sun in the firmament in which it rules the day, shining on the just and the unjust—and that every dissenting body, may shine as the stars in the present and last day. "*Are we blind also?*" ask the modern Separatists. Who can better meet their pretensions than by directing them to the pages of the law which they profess to adopt and obey so much more perfectly than the clergy. "*And Jesus said, for judgement I am come into this world, that they which see not might see: and that they which see might be made blind. If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, 'we see: therefore your sin remaineth.'*" So much in address to those who object to pay church rates, saying "*that they*"

are rendering to Cæsar the things which be God's." I will now discuss THE DEMAND OF THEM BY CÆSAR: thinking as I do, that church rates are simply of "*the things which be Cæsar's.*"

The question, therefore, now remaining, thus presents itself, "*Is Cæsar, that is, is the government, as constituted in these kingdoms, JUSTIFIED IN LONGER DEMANDING THEM? I, for one, say that IT IS NOT.*" I do not deny the power or right which originally imposed them on the land. I do not deny the power now possessed of enforcing their payment: far from either. Herod had the power and right to condemn the Baptist: the government has the power of calling out the military to act the part of reason: but the death of John has not yet established the innocence of tyranny, murder, or adultery: and the wielding of the sword, the charging with the bayonet, or raking streets with artillery, are arguments which no circumstances can palliate, unless the flag of peace, and conciliation precedes them, and the principles of Christianity are first heard in prevention. It is upon these principles, and under the banners of universal peace, that instead of leaving the cause to Dissenters alone, I stand forth an avowed CLAIMANT FOR THE ABOLITION, and no less than THE ABOLITION *of church rates.* It is known, Fellow-Christians, that a commutation was preferred by the late parliament, and supported by the premier of the new ministry—it is said that "*A RE-ACTION*" *has taken place* among the people: I hope that it will extend its influence to the senate, and the throne:—it cannot now be alledged against me that I take the *popular* side of the question; for the tools of that party of whom a majority are now said to be preferred, and elected, and returned by the people as their representatives, have, thinking to be before the hands that

are to use them, bandied to, and fro from each other, have published in electioneering addresses, have repeated on their canvasses, and their hustings, till every one is tired of seeing and hearing the words, *that they are "in favour of a COMMUTATION OF church rates."* Where, then, let me ask, is the *boasted "re-action"* on this subject: *commutation* was proposed by the late ministry—*commutation* is favoured by the hammers of the new. *Commutation-men* are said to be returned by the people. Where, then, is "*the re-action*" here: *it is*, as the commutation bill at the departure of Lord Althorp from the king's council, *found wanting*. But *will it long remain so*? If prediction be not presumptuous, I predict that all the *commutation tools* will shortly have to draw their own teeth: I predict that Sir Robert Peel will shew himself a man of too sound sense, to incur, as a minister, the responsibility of so impolitic a measure, however ready he may have shewn himself to evade the appearance of faction by consenting to accept the same from his predecessors. But we must not repose too much confidence in individual sense: the magnetic influences of premiership sometimes are too weak to overcome the factiousness of those who make their stake on consistency in error: and it may so happen, that Sir Robert Peel, with all his abilities, (and no one esteems them higher than myself,) may be like others weak enough to think a compromise of them not too high a price to pay for the co-operation of bigotry, and intolerance, supposing that some votaries to them should not feel "*a re-action.*" We must, therefore, look to the arguments which the "*SIR ORACLES*" of the old school urged in favour of church rates as they are, and against the commutation proposed by Lord Althorp, and supported by Sir Robert Peel; for, marvellous to record, there are, or rather there were last year

those high in the church and state who thought that even the latter went too far. In refuting these arguments I wish that we could by possibility meet the adversaries of reform without the mediation of a third person. But as these are the days when *anonymous* publications are the *safest*, I must beg of Mr. Rose, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to allow himself to become the medium between me and the Editor of the *British Magazine*: this Editor is of course a nonentity: "*non est inventus*:" he may be, for what I know, a very good Christian; a very Orthodox divine; a very zealous Churchman: but I should think better of him if he did not "*minister questions which edify not*:" if he were not so *parasitical* an author, "*that is to say, either destitute of the power of pumping up nourishment for his own opinions from their own soil, or unable to exist without absorbing the juices of other vegetables*." But he is like the great automaton chess-player; he is a nonentity, and if likely to be beat, he sweeps the table before him, pen, ink, and paper, and says "*the Editor does not hold himself responsible*:" and "*this is the periodical which ought to be on every clergyman's table*"!!! *O tempora, Omores clericales*!! I daresay, however, that Mr. Rose, notwithstanding the Editor's irresponsibility, knows where his letter-box is, and let it be taken as a confession that the defence of church rates is given up, if Mr. Rose, does not as a friend of the said Editor obtain insertion in an early number of the said Magazine for a letter from himself; first, *plainly refuting the arguments* which I now advance against the plea, urged by THE EDITOR in petitions, which he *presumed* TO DICTATE to the clergy, and their parishioners against church rates—and secondly, *flatly denying the historical fact which, I here assert to be true beyond Mr. Rose's power of contradiction*.

The Editor in his Petitions which he circulated "*finding it impossible to shew a spirit of concession,*" urges in defence of Church Rates, that they are "*a rent-charge upon property itself older by centuries than the title to any estate on which it falls.*" (See Petitions to Parliament, or rather I should say DICTATIONS, pages 597 and 643, No. XXIX. BRITISH MAGAZINE.) Let us meet this plea, presuming that when the Editor dictates "*property,*" he means landed property.

First, I adduce this simple argument *against the charge continuing exclusively on the land*; viz. that land is no longer that predominating species of property which it was when Church Rates were first imposed, and upon the principle that an Established Church is for the comfort of all persons, rich and poor, and for the security and prosperity of all property, great or small, I consequently maintain that Church Rates are a charge, which should no longer be a partial burden, but should, if levied at all, *be levied equally on all property*, be its description what it may.

Secondly, *Against the validity of the plea of custom*, I borrow the words of a speech of Lord Althorp's, in opposing the Septennial Act, (Morning Herald, May 16, 1834,) "I am in the habit of considering the practical utility of any measure, the wisest mode of legislation. It is not enough to prove the necessity of a measure at the present day to establish the fact that it has been in use and practice." This is a two-edged sword: let Mr. Rose tell us whether it does not cut one foot of the Editor from under him: the Editor may use it against me as he likes.

But the Editor urges THE ANTIQUITY of the "*rent-charge*" as a vindication of Church Rates: "*older by centuries than the title of any estate on which it falls.*" Now for another two-edged sword sharper and

sharper still.—Every body knows that time does not destroy the title of the Church: *neither can it annul its liability*. In favour therefore of abolishing Church Rates, and transferring them to the ecclesiastical revenues, I deem it enough to shew that they are a charge to which those revenues were once liable: and as THE DICTATOR OF THE PETITIONS alluded to is so mighty fond of appealing to history, I will just remind him of a part which he keeps back, not quite so favourable to his own representations and ends, as that which he finds for his own interest to put forward. The Editor may call me by what name he likes: *radical, destructive, traitor, infidel*, or any worse which his own vocabulary supplies in condemnation of clergymen who presume to differ with him. If the Editor would take the trouble to read the article in the British Critic, on “Extremes in Religion” already alluded to, he might perhaps take a few hints of advantage to himself. “*The parallelism between the original and travesty*”—the “*reductio ad absurdum*” of Mr. Rose’s theory, (page 219 British Critic, No. XXXIII.) may help to shew him “*his own face in a glass*.” But I forget: the Editor has no more face than name: “*il n’y a point des roses sans epines* ;” a French proverb which puts me in mind that I am compelled to ask the mediation of a third person: and that I have selected the author of a Sermon, entitled “CHRISTIANS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD,” as the respondent for the Editor—I address myself to “*The Rev. H. J. Rose, B. D., Chaplain to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Rector of Fairsted, Essex*,” as “*a Christian*.” Let him emit his “*light to shine before men*,” Let him become “*a light to lighten the Gentiles*,” to correct the errors and party representations of the Editor of the British Magazine. Leaving the Editor to settle his opinions with the public, and thinking no evil, I now

address myself direct to *Mr. Rose* as "*a Christian*:" as an individual, whom (in the ardent hope that he will now turn reformer) without any affectation or insincerity I gladly give my humble endeavours to hold forth "*a light to the world*," in the words of the British Critic, (Art. Extremes in Religion.—Hampden, Atkinson, Gathercole, page 209.) "We feel that we are on delicate ground: but when we find sentiments which, even if true and just, in the sense which the writer means them to be taken, have yet a tendency to betray inferior minds into extravagance (and ERROR,) promulgated by one of the most excellent, the most eloquent, and the most influential men in the church—one who is chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and whose sermon is dedicated to the Bishop of London, and printed by his lordship's desire—we should deem it a positive dereliction of our office not to state our honest apprehensions. Mr. Rose, we are assured, knows too well, and pleads too well "*the duty of maintaining the truth*," to suffer even the most transient sensation of anger to cross his mind against us, when we conscientiously declare what we believe THE TRUTH to be. '*Truth always, truth at all hazards*,' we would take as our motto: and therefore by his sermon to which we are now alluding—that sermon so full of high moral persuasiveness—so full of exalted and holy doctrines—so full of uncompromising and passionate devotion to principle," I call upon Mr. Rose to publish his authentic opinion upon "*words of dubious import*" (though certain tendency), found in the petitions dictated in the British Magazine, on *Church Rates*.—I call upon Mr. Rose, by "his high and heavenly office"—as a watchman on the tower—as a doer and not a preacher only,—as "*A CHRISTIAN*" having the power and not only the name of TRUTH, to say, whether THE EDITOR in those petitions

spoke the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.—I call upon Mr. Rose, in the face of the whole world, as he values the honour of his patrons, the security of the church, the respectability of himself, the triumph of principle, the glory of God, to falsify if he can the fact, which is matter of history *that the Ecclesiastical Revenues were originally charged with all the expenses of sustaining the buildings* of the Established Church.* For my own part it is so much the fashion to appeal to history only with the partial hope of confirming mistaken prejudices, that very little would persuade me to doubt its utility; but as the advocates of church rates, rest their case upon "*their centuries old*;" I have consented to meet these lovers of antiquity among the moss and cobwebs they so infinitely prefer to justice, generosity, and candour: in compliment to their predilection, I have applied the steel of truth to the neglected flint of profane history, and I leave to my reader to decide whether the petitioners against any interference with church rates are not dead beat in their own armoury. To say nothing of Gregory's direction to

* I deem it quite superfluous to point out the various charges sprung up within later years now classed and levied under the head of church rates, *which are* parish rates, quite impertinent to matters of conscience, and the duties of the desk belonging to the Established ministry; and I think *shameful oppression of the middle and lower orders of rate payers, who prefer simplicity to stateliness.* Dissenters know these as well as churchmen, and I leave to Lord Althorp and the supporters of his commutation bill to vindicate it from its appearance of deception; to commute a local burden into a land tax, to charge the north and east for a variety of purposes which extend no further than the south and west: or to make Yorkshire landlords and farmers pay the organist, the bill for lighting, carving, and gilding of St. James's, St. George's, St. Martin's, &c., seems to me not only to say to Yorkshiremen "you are not fit to look after your own concerns," but also *to oppress them*, by compelling them to pay Londoner's debts, If £.250,000 per year can be spared out of the land tax, there are plenty of ways of giving land the full benefit of it, without saddling it with a certain

Austin, it is a fact beyond contradiction that Alfred after separating the revenues of the bishops from the receipts of the parochial clergy, assigned one part of the tithes, "*Ad ecclesiæ reparationem*:" and "as history does not present a man more amiable in his public and private character, and whose virtues entitled him to a throne more than this great and benevolent hero," (see Lempriere's Dictionary.) "I hope and pray to God that KING WILLIAM IV. will emulate in respect to church matters, ALFRED THE GREAT, who devoted a reign of 28 years to the happiness of his people." And here, my Christian reader, if truth can entitle any man to the palm of victory, I might claim it in favour of the abolition of church rates: but I am now becoming an old soldier in *truth's* cause, and have not now to learn the shiftness of her uncertain friends. Beaten at every other point, the defendants for church rates, instead of maintaining "*truth always and at all hazards*," instead of practising what they preach, and letting their light shine before men, they first *hoodwink truth*, and when the veil is removed, they tell us that EXPEDIENCY is their last, their impenetrable coat of mail. EXPEDIENCY!!! Fellow-Christians, trace this principle from its birth to its present dominion: would to God that it had been smothered in its cradle or nipped in its bud. It was *expediency*, which

fixed national burden, in the place of a local charge which tenants can any time prevent from exceeding just bounds. My anticipation and hope is, that Sir Robert Peel will take warning from Lord Althorp's failure, and not renew a measure already condemned. If, however, he thinks any change better than none, he will forgive the friendship which "*with every warmest wish sincere and free*" forwarns him of his fall.

"This verse at least be yours and boldly tell,
That if you fall, not unadvised you fell,
But blest with virtue and with sense adorned,
A willing victim of the fools you scorned."

induced Adam and Eve to seek an increase of knowledge—which hardened the heart of Pharaoh to deny the straw, and yet demand the bricks—which suggested to the Israelites to loath the manna “*and lust for the flesh, and while the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the people, and the Lord smote the people with a very great plague.*” It was *expediency* that induced the misery of Jerusalem, the profanation of the temple, that avarice of the priesthood, which the pattern of reformers, that terror of the anti’s, NEHEMIAH in pity and indignant fury became the blessed means of arresting:—it was *expediency* that encouraged oppression, and gave strength to coercion, till the form of government of the chosen people of God was changed and changed again, and they at last became no people, an outcast among nations. These are the glorious achievements of *expediency*!! “Woe, (saith the Almighty by Isaiah) *Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight, that call evil good, and good evil.*” Oh, let the natives of our Capernaum, exalted even unto Heaven, not forget the depths of Hell. When the same principle is called in to the relief of property, to the avowed and confessed exclusion of the principle of the Divine Law, where is the power that can avert, where is the arm that shall stay, whose are the tears that shall quench, whose is the tongue that can forbid, if the prophecy shall be fulfilled against England as against Israel, “*therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and its blossom shall go up as dust, because they have cast away the law of the Lord of Hosts, and despised the word of the Holy one of Israel.*” (Isaiah v. 24.) Look to this and answer ye votaries to history!—look and tremble ye champions of property, “*who take counsel but not of God.*”

Look to this, and set your house in order, ye *Bishops of the Church of England*: look to this and learn, O KING and all people: and charity will conspire with humanity to engage your prayers, that the fate of BAR-JESUS, the visitation on Elymas may overtake some hypocrite, ere the deputy of this country allow himself to be turned from the faith—"that the deputy when he sees what is done may believe, and he who may be the chosen vessel of correction may turn, undistracted by visible objects, to see the things which belong to his peace, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord." Shall we, my fellow-Christians, bow down before this idol, which the world sets up: "the Lord pardon me in this thing, when my master goeth into the house of Rimmon: when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon his servant in this thing." I would to God that Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego were yet alive. I bow down before expediency; but why? only to add my weight to the cord that shall pull the idol down. The friends of church rates will grant the partiality of their oppression on land: they will withdraw the plea of custom—they will confess that when they petition about "*a rent-charge centuries old*," they speak not the whole truth—they will say, "*we give up every position but one, and here we will stand till we die*." "*EXPEDIENCY is our strong hold*." Nil desperandum! Fellow-Christians, perseverance seldom fails. If truth ever prevailed over falsehood, if reason ever overcame bigotry, the boasted fortress of the enemy shall fall. Thank God, I have not now to trust to my own prowess; I now join the ranks of a leader against whose breast-plate the arrows of prejudice and the rancour of party spirit recoil with fatal bluntness on archers who draw the bow.—Ye votaries to Expediency, will ye yield where the Archbishop of Canterbury does?

After certain and unequivocal expressions of disapprobation on the Irish Church Bill, His Grace thus proceeded,

“ I will begin with the vestry cess, a tax which I am told, and “ which I readily believe is considered most odious in Ireland. I “ can easily conceive why it should be a source of dissatisfaction “ from the difference between the religious opinions of those who “ are called upon to pay it : *and I, therefore, for one, am most ready “ to give it up*, if the people are determined not to bear it. *It leads “ to perpetual irritation, and I yield on the ground of EXPEDIENCY.*”

EXPEDIENCY, let me add, such as dictated the release of Israel by Pharoah—such as humbled the pride of the people of Israel into a spirit of prayer—EXPEDIENCY such as induced Noah and his family to betake themselves to the ark—such as drove our first parents to seek to cover their shame for the sin which they had in the hour of temptation wanted strength to avoid—EXPEDIENCY, my fellow-Christians, WHICH IS EQUALLY ACTIVE *in favour of the transfer of church rates to the ecclesiastical revenues in England as in Ireland* : for whether we look to the principles involved, *the “ odiousness” acknowledged, the “ dissatisfaction” admitted, or “ the perpetual irritation” begot* ; I may truly say “ *Cælum non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt* :” unless, indeed, this equality of circumstances be denied, and we be driven to urge another argument which gives to the scale of abolition in England wonderful preponderance, *viz. that concession made to CATHOLICS can never with any justice or consistency be withheld from PROTESTANTS*. No one seeks more than myself to avoid invidious distinctions ; no one desires more to see all sects share, and share alike the favour and attention of government ; but if others obstinately provoke distinctions, it seems to me a natural and necessary consequence to claim the preference for those especially of the same household of faith ; but it will be time enough to pur-

sue this distinction, when we find a *Protestant prelacy* evincing "*the faith with respect of persons.*" Let who will advance or oppose commutation, THE BISHOP'S hands are tied down: *they* MUST VOTE FOR ABOLITION. But the votaries to expediency will say, the Archbishop of Canterbury may yield, but we "*find it impossible to shew a spirit of concession:*" we have, indeed, by eulogising his Grace's feelings and opinions in our organ, the "*British Magazine*, done our best some time ago "to propagate them; but we have changed our mind: "we now want all the signatures we can get to petitions "against the effect of those very feelings and opinions; "we now turn our back upon our patron's infallibility, "and leave to you the responsibility of presuming it." The Editor of the *British Magazine* may safely do so. To whom, let me ask, will the advocates of church rates consent to refer in preference to the Primate? Friend or foe, it is all the same to me: it is said that a re-action has taken place, that the people are now come to their senses, and have proved their wisdom by the events of the late election. Shall I appeal to the people as the infallible oracle? will my opponents consent? no, forsooth, "*a re-action*" immediately recurs. Men only admit the wisdom of the people when they anticipate that the people will recognize their infallibility in return. Directly that a *reformer* appeals to the people, they become "*populace*;" the "*Vox Dei*" as soon as it is destructive of the self-importance of opponents, becomes "*the voice of Beelzebub.*" The people are then called "*canaille*," and the appellant "*the dog on the Rialto.*" Be it so again: to whom will the *worshippers of Expediency* consent to appeal? "TO THEMSELVES!!" be it so. Fortunately the question, by which I shall interrupt their hopes, is not one which requires much candour; and

so they may be able for once to acquit themselves as the supreme court, tolerably well. Now what is *the plea of expediency* which the Editor of the British Magazine and his "*tail*" of petitioners put in as their last prop of a failing cause. They say: not exactly in these words, but to this effect, "*we find it impossible to shew the same spirit of concession as that we so loudly eulogised in the Primate, because we now think that the abolition of church rates would be a precedent for the abolition of tithes.*" No one can feel any thing but pity for the weakness of the reasoning faculties, which by this plea the *infallibles* betray; unless, indeed, we should be compelled to meet it as the duplicity of wisdom above that which is written, thinking to delude inconsiderate parishioners into the notion that church rates are the same things as tithes. But this is an object which I will not hastily credit in the Editor, much as he allows himself to be carried away by party spirit: such an object would do credit to the arch fiend himself, who always suits his arguments to his hearers, and often drops his victim into the ditch, by distracting his attention to the mountain at a distance. The objectors to church rates might, I think, have stuck to their captain, and yielded "*pari passu*" with the Archbishop of Canterbury, but it is always as well, whenever we can, "*to be all things to all men*:" and so in spite of the bitings of lips which I fear contradiction will occasion to the Editor of the British Magazine, I shall leave the subject of church rates, with adding but one more simple statement which completely banishes *all fear of the precedent*. So far from the abolition of church rates becoming a precedent for the abolition of tithes, the transfer of the former to the ecclesiastical revenues would be the strongest possible confirmation which could be devised for the latter; for if parliament

should adjudge that on the clergy, as tithe-owners, shall again be imposed the charge "*ecclesiis reparandis*," which accompanied the creation of tithes, and to which for centuries their receipts continued liable; the property, the antiquity of the title by which that property is held, and the propriety of the clergy are all recognized "*a priori*" in the judgement, and *the consequent injunction "that the clergy shall henceforth repair their churches, &c."* is *the signing, sealing, and delivering over, of tithes afresh to the Established Church*. Let the Editor of the British Magazine acknowledge this, (and his contradiction of such *common sense law* would only hurt himself) and we shall be as good friends in argument, as I can assure him if I may judge him by myself, we are at heart: for however on paper I may defy the powder of his magazine, it is only because if he does not take care, in his zeal to "*become a light to the world*," to lighten us reforming Gentiles, *by abusing us merely for doubting his infallibility*, he will blow up the church, in whose defence we differ in the means, not in spirit and intention.

With regard to the violation of the religious liberty of the subject committed by the imposition of church rates, it would lead to too deep theological disputation to enter upon it here. I therefore content myself with asserting that violation. As a PROTESTANT, I hold that the liberty wherewith Christ has set us free extends *freedom* in all religious enquiries *to the will, to the understanding, to the judgement, and to the conscience*: and I maintain (let who will take the contrary part) that all these are brought into bondage by church rates.—*The will and understanding* in that a bias against inquiry, and dangerous in case of inquiry to a just and impartial entertainment of the doctrines which we preach, is naturally generated by any compulsory payment of money demanded in spite

of all objection and scruples which may arise.—*The judgment and the conscience*, in that, supposing just and impartial reflection, the inquirer is not at liberty to decide the course he is to pursue.—It is obvious, therefore that my anticipation from the abolition of church rates is that it would tend to a more candid and a patient consideration of our doctrines, and a more liberal and just construction of our motives—an anticipation which alone would be quite sufficient to induce me to advocate the experiment at all risks ; and as to any diminution of income which might threaten to depress the clergy from their renewed liability, I feel myself as qualified as any man to predict that in no case would they be losers but through their own mismanagement or want of proper conduct. There is a moral feeling, a respect, a sympathy in others, whether rich or poor, towards those who do their best, which if left uninjured by compulsory charges will carry the clergy through the apparently most forbidding difficulties : and the more necessitous a clergyman, the more will those motives actuate his parishioners voluntarily to incur what when compulsory they resist. “ One man may lead a horse to water, but a thousand cannot make him drink : ” and sure am I that no one thing has injured the Established Church more, and dried up the springs of liberality so much, as the imposition of church rates. The transfer of them to the clergy, if ever effected, will be the dawn of happier days to them : it will revive for them and the church all the advantages without any of the banes of the voluntary system ; it will prove (at least such is my anticipation) the greatest stimulus to new endowments, and before many years the first step to such unity, as shall eventually secure even from the dissenting members of the House of Commons, a liberal consideration of our inability to meet all the demands now made upon us with unbecoming acrimony.

I now leave the subject of church rates ; it has led me to much greater length than in compliment to the patience of the reader, I desired : but now or never must the struggle for abolition succeed. I appeal to the reader, as a *fellow-Christian* ; I ask him to consider the duties, the spirit, the tolerance, the long-suffering, the deliberation, the self-denial, the charity which so sacred a profession entails : I ask him to weigh what I have said, to throw into the same scale *the influence which* DISSENTERS *now exercise over public morals and national order* : their zeal and contention to preach with us, "*not ourselves, but Christ crucified* : " the difference which is said to be as forty to one in the property of Churchmen over that of Dissenters : and if, after all, he can reconcile it with his principles and profession to make them pay for our "*houses of prayer*," when we are free from all charge in return—when they, with so far less means, have greater difficulties, greater expenses, greater sacrifices, greater temptations consequent upon their desire to propagate doctrines and forms, which they think as true and sound as we do those to which we hold fast :—if after all, my fellow-Christian, you can say "So "help me God I entertain no doubt of the propriety of "continuing church rates, or rendering the church by "commutation of them a source of national taxation—" I see no hardship, no grievance of Dissenters, no want of "generosity, no infringement of the laws of toleration, no "bondage to custom, no relict of papal supremacy in so "determining."—If you can say this, I can only lament your conclusion. Far be from me to condemn you : "*I judge no man, yea, I judge not my own self : it is the Lord that judgeth* :"—in such case I leave to the last day to decide my innocence or guilt for calling upon Cæsar in the name of mercy, judgement, and truth, in the name of that liberty wherewith Christ has made us

free, "*To abolish church rates and transfer the charge to the Ecclesiastical Revenues,*" whence it was taken.*

It may indeed be said, to yield now is cowardice: such an opinion savours rather of the camp than the fold: invasion is tyranny: and when the forefathers of a man have appropriated land which subsequently is discovered to belong to another, he who withdraws his fence to the just boundary under the threat of a law-suit, shews wisdom, prudence, and justice, and cowardice is foreign to his motives. Thinking therefore as I do, that church rates are an invasion into the territory of religious liberty, I shall consider that minister the best friend to the church, and the doctrines which we preach, who in the hour of her danger, retreats to the just barrier of power. He who prefers concession on such points to hostility, is the minister of good—he the bravest conqueror who vanquishes his own prejudices—he the best statesman who fearlessly courts the title of apostate—in order to replace the sword with the laurel branch, in order to fertilize his country by the favour of God, instead of the blood of his massacred countrymen—in order that where we now look for *judgement and behold oppression, for righteousness and behold iniquity*, there may spring up the abundant harvest of justice and toleration.

We now come to the

ADMISSION OF DISSENTERS TO THE UNIVERSITIES;
a question on which the lengthened opposition to church

* If once determined by Parliament that the transfer shall be made to the tithes, I can conceive no difficulty in an amicable arrangement among the clergy, by which livings of small value may be totally exonerated from the renewed charge. Diocesan funds, raised by a percentage on all benefices whatever above a certain value to be fixed, and raised always in advance for the year to come, seem at first sight to offer a just and the easiest method to accomplish that end. But these are details, prematurely thought of, till the transfer is obtained: and I am confident that the creation of a fund at all is necessary only as an act of precaution to obviate the possible evils of trusting too rashly to the voluntary system.

rates compels me to forego a full expression of my opinions : it is one indeed which I would have omitted to notice at all, did it not appear to me that the present "*crisis*" seems to me the only season, when a clergyman can "*speak out*" on such subjects, without exposing himself to being suspected and accused of motives, which ill-natured persons opposed to liberal principles are so fond of attributing to those in a humble station of life, (*espccially if in Holy Orders,*) who dare to differ with themselves. The *infullibles* now maintain that "*a re-action*" has taken place, that the voice of the people long raised against them is now as loud in their favour ; all persons therefore who like myself abhor the system of yielding to popularity or public opinion what is due to principle and justice cannot make too much of the fleeting moments of such delusion : for delusion I am sure it is, if any think for an instant that the government of this country can ever again be conducted on oligarchical high-church principles. Let reformers now at this crisis when the popular voice is said to be against them, shew that the alledged contradiction by the people makes no difference to them : that it neither impels them forward nor pulls them backward. It is solely that the fleeting moments of such delusion may not pass away unimproved even by such a cypher as myself, that I seize upon them to record my *BIAS* as in favour of the admission of Dissenters to the Universities. You will in justice to me, reader, observe that I write "*bias*", only, because the matter at issue is far too important to allow any one to form, still less to publish, a hasty, crude or premature *opinion*. In compliment however to those, who honour these pages with their perusal, and to evince my desire not to injure a good cause by an appearance of what might be thought time-serving caution on

my part, I shall give the reason for the *bias* which is in me, and hope thereby to satisfy every candid mind (the approbation of the illiberal I should deem an infliction!) that I am not waiting, till the tide turns again, ere I decide to launch my little bark on the wide ocean of reform. For my own part, when I have a good boat, I rather like pulling against the stream. We all know that a clergyman must make up his mind at least to hazard the friendship of the world : and when waters run with us, there is no trial of the strength of our crew. At a moment then (for at all events it is but a moment) when liberal principles are said to be at a discount, I seek again to shew myself in their ranks, by saying that I regard and value *the universities as national, not exclusively ecclesiastical, institutions*. I am aware of the very forcible argument opposed to this view, viz:—*that many endowments have been made since the reformation on the faith of their exclusive character*: I am aware that among those, who urge this argument, there are many of whose motives, talents, and judgement to speak, write, or think slightly, would reflect deformity upon myself, without casting dimness upon the mirror which is before me: but surely as *the exclusives* think their opponents mistaken, we may assume the same liberty and decline their opinions in return, without seeming to build our prevalence upon their demerits. I cannot agree to recognize this their argument in favour of exclusiveness of our universities as sufficient reason for perpetuating that character, because in the absence of any new especial agreement in favour of later endowments, it is not enough to establish their exclusive intention to say, that the dotators did so and so under such and such impressions. There are two parties to the bargain, and unless there can be produced some documents or deeds distinguishing later endowments, and exempting

them from the same interference to which the former ones were unquestionably liable, it follows as a necessary inference that all are placed under the same law, and that the King and Parliament may exercise that power, which by the trust is conveyed to them, just as freely in the favour of others, as it has been exercised hitherto to the exclusive advantage of ourselves. I say thus much in reply to the exclusives merely because I desire to set to the reader an example of caution and care in forming his own conclusions. The argument here combated neither makes for or against my bias : for I take my stand not upon the nationality of the universities, but upon the impregnable rock, that since the world began "*truth never lost by inquiry.*" If the Established Church be not of God, it is useless for man to seek long to protect her : admit or exclude Dissenters from the universities, it will make no difference,—the Establishment will come to nothing ; like dust however thick at present, it will vanish away before the wind ! But if our doctrines be *truth*, then the more dissentients are associated with the members of the church, the more certain the uprooting of dissent ; if we are the reflectors of the true light, let us shine before men : let Dissent come to the light, and she shall be enlightened. It is, I know, a true proverb, that "*evil communications corrupt good manners,*" and no less certain that good principles and sound opinions are liable to the contagion of bad society : but in reply to this let it be remembered that the truth of Solomon's predictions is a matter of experience with all who have ever made the experiment. "*He that walketh with wise men shall be wise,*" and "*the lips of the wise disperse knowledge.*" To hesitate to act upon these truths, assured as they are to us by experience, seems to me to indicate a doubt of the correctness of our

own doctrines—(which if we doubt we owe to ourselves to open to discussion) or of our own ability to maintain them, or a distrust in the promise of strength vouchsafed to every Christian exertion. “By the sweat of his brow man is to earn his bread all the days of his life ;” and what is true of his earthly destiny is true also of his future: it is by industry alone that we can with any reason expect to see the vine bring forth grapes, or weeds eradicated from the vineyard.

“Whoever thinks must see that man was made
 “*To face the storm*, not languish in the shade.
 “Action’s his sphere, and for that sphere designed
 “Eternal pleasures open on his mind.
 “For this, fair hope leads on the impassioned soul
 “Thro’ life’s wild labyrinths to her distant goal :”
 “Paints in each dream, to fan the genial flame,”
 “The pomp of riches, or the pride of fame :”
 “*Or fondly gives reflection’s cooler eye*”
 “*A glance, an image of a future sky.*”

(The Regulation of the Passions, the Source of Human Happiness.)—*Cawthorn.*

He who will not struggle for freedom, deserves to be a slave; that church which cowers at every storm, and dare not face the tempest, merits not the crown of ascendancy: if, like the sluggard, we say, “*there is a lion in the way, I shall be slain in the street:*” we should meet but our just doom, when we became as degraded as we should shew ourselves degenerate. “*In the morning,*” says the preacher, “*sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand, for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good.*” But to return to the argument that “*evil communications corrupt good manners,*” and that *Christian principles* are liable to infection from *Socinian*. It is,

my fellow-Christians, from a solicitude to arrest the growth of the latter, that I desire to see the universities opened ; for I maintain that the too common and too highly sanctioned practice of execrating dissent from ourselves as a wilful delusion is as impolitic as it is unjust and un-Christian : I assert that on the principles of their own profession, all members of the legislature are bound to take the most favorable view of the principles of Dissenters, whenever their interests are under their notice : they may, and indeed ought to object to the tendency of "*zeal not according to knowledge*:" but the only way by which its errors can be corrected, is by recognizing the existence of zeal : and then you may with some chance of success press your entreaty, "*come, let us reason together*." If you begin by saying "What is dissent ? who are Dissenters ? nothing, forsooth, but the spirit of evil, and the refuse of the people:" you may, indeed, provoke collision in which you may or may not prove victorious : but you at once preclude all hope of attention, by which you must arrive at agreement. Whereas, if we judge others by ourselves, if we regard their sincerity and industry in searching for the precious pearl to be equal with our own—if we Churchmen esteem those who object to us, and our ascendancy, to be equally with ourselves hungering and thirsting after that wisdom which is from above—equally with ourselves open to conviction of the justice and necessity of regulating every social community, according to that system of graduation which has marked the progress of the world from the first to the present moment of its existence—which is developed in the earth and out of the earth ; in the waters beneath, and the firmament above ; in the forest, the field, and the garden—if we recognize *their* zeal, Dissenters will endure that we tell them that it is "*not according to knowledge*," and the probability, yea, the certainty

is, that they will shew a disposition *to try this question* at least in friendliness, and may be in an honest and good heart :—which, if they do, the result will be the glory, and triumph of *truth*, and such a unity, as it entereth not into my power to describe. The strength of his own convictions is the very best footing which man can desire for the purpose of fearlessly encountering opposition : to shrink from contest or decline association ; to say, “*you shall be shut out of the universities because you will not agree with the Established Church,*” seems to me the climax of folly and impolicy : it is to put the sword into the hands of our enemies, and the reproof into their mouths, “*ye will not come to the light least your deeds should be reprov’d.*” We all know that we are sent to “*go forth to them without the camp bearing the reproach :*” where, then, can we find justification if we shut the door against those who seek to enter ? Should they prove spies, may not a Joshua or a Caleb be of their number ? should they prove traitors, is there no power to controul or eject them ? should they prove rebellious, is there no authority to make laws to repress them ? are we always to be obliged to retain the same statutes, many of which are so ludicrously absurd that the enforcement of them would empty all colleges to-morrow ? are we here, as on church rates, to be told of statutes “*centuries old ?*” really these antiquarians had at once better bring the question of their love of the obsolete to an issue, by beginning to preach that civilized and enlightened man should forswear warmer or more decent clothing than Adam : or go a step still further back, and,—but no : I will not pursue the “*reductio in absurdum :*”—this brings me, my fellow-Christians, to say why I do not now *positively* advocate the admission of Dissenters,—why, at present I will not commit myself by saying more than that my “*bias*” is in favour of such a change. My reason is this ; that I think

upon this subject "*all things are lawful, but all things are not expedient*—I think the *question* one of *preliminaries*, not of principle: and upon the nature of those preliminaries, over which no one can have less controul than myself, will ever depend the decision of my opinion. I should only render myself a stumbling block of offence to friends, and a laughing-stock of ill-nature among enemies, were I to presume to suggest what I think those preliminaries should be, more particularly as I feel fearful that I am almost singular in my views, and should, therefore, have all the odium if wrong, and none of the credit if right. I will, however, go one step further, because it may serve to call the attention of those, with whom I do not agree to a re-consideration of their own opinions. Certain it is that there is a large, a very large number of persons, who think that Dissenters can be admitted to degrees, and yet excluded from the honours, emoluments, fellowships, and offices which are intended to distinguish the most learned, and to reward the most deserving; and from what *Lord Stanley* has said upon the question, I believe that I am correct in esteeming his lordship as one of the leaders, if not *the leader* of this party. (I here use the word *party* in no offensive sense.) Now it is impossible for any one to respect and admire Lord Stanley more than myself: and if any thing had been wanting to confirm that respect and admiration, it is the part he is taking at present: a part, which if it be slighted by the present ministers, they will deserve the infamy which will overtake them. The best proof of my respect for Lord Stanley, which I can give is, the interest I evince in his career, and the freedom with which I hazard his dislike, by calling in question the wisdom of a qualified or restricted admission; and by saying, at the same time, that except his vote on two other subjects, this is the only leading question on which I

have ever doubted his statesmanship; for as to his religious principles, the rectitude of these is far out of the reach of his greatest enemy. To attempt a qualified or restricted admission of Dissenters to the universities, is I am confident, if not a work of supererogation, an act which will end in the loss of its object: and if ever the experiment is made, I hope that I may stand recorded among those who proclaimed it as a delusion. There is an old proverb, vulgar to use, I daresay it will be said, but as I never aspire to favour from critical acumen, as I am content if I make myself understood, I shall adopt it here: "*keep the binn locked if you don't want your horses to have the corn.*" I for one say, "*keep the door of the universities shut and barred, if you do not intend Dissenters to have the run of the house.*" If once you let them in, the only chambers from which you can exclude them are those fellowships, and offices which are necessarily held by men in Holy Orders. This is my firm anticipation; and if wrong, I have at least done no harm by declaring it. And now while on the subject of the universities, as it is not *probable* that I shall ever publicly revert to the question, I will here say a few words as to

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE UNIVERSITIES.

As far as this is concerned, whether Dissenters or not are hereafter admitted in no-wise affects my present opinion: the discipline may be improved, it cannot be made worse. I shall, however, here advert to only one point in utter reprobation of it. I mean the practice of compelling attendance at chapel, whether as a morning muster-call, or as a punishment for some offence against authority. I will not discuss the question: it would lead to too great length—I am but one; but as one, I say—"the sooner it is done away, and replaced by some less blasphemous method of ascertaining the presence of the under-

graduates, the better. It does no good; it never can do good to, while in many cases it tends to confirm, the profligate;—it gives no check to, it often seems to lead on, the thoughtless;—and what is of more moment than either, it “*hinders those who would enter in*”;—it disgusts the pious, and, perhaps, in the years of their otherwise only temporary suspension, it supplants sound principles by a contempt or dislike for all outward forms or evidences of devotion, if not by a habit of ridiculing them as hypocritical in others, which borders upon irreligion, and infidelity in ourselves. As for the compulsory reception of receiving the Holy Sacrament, while in justice I declare that such discipline is confined to a few colleges, I believe myself equal to the trial when I say that if ever I can promise myself either by my voice or pen to become serviceable to arrest such a practice, this is one from which my feelings recoil in such indignation and abhorrence, that I will risk my preferment rather than lose the opportunity of withstanding it: nothing of my doing, can, I know, blot out my foul offence in having been “*partaker in the sin*:” the fact, however, that my obedience was rendered to authority, may, perhaps, palliate it in the judgement of man, however my own interest may have suggested it; be this as it may, I write not to vindicate myself. My object is to lend my aid, however weak, to promote REFORM—to expose the banefulness of what I think is wrong, in order that others may avoid the remorse which my own weakness has justly entailed upon myself; and now that I look upon such things not as a thoughtless youth, but as a father in the retrospect, if not in the future, I can conscientiously say that I should think it inconsistent to pray for a son, that “*he should be delivered from evil, and not led into temptation*,” if I sent him to a seminary where both are abundant, and neither in an

honest and good heart sought to be repressed : I should think it an act of sinful heedlessness as a father, if I launched an ingenuous, and high-spirited son on the intoxicating waters of chance, unbanked, and unconfined as they were at Oxford, in the days of my own youth : I say it as a conscientious Churchman, or if it makes more against me, *as a beneficed clergyman of the Established Church*, that I would see a son expelled before he should be made to receive the body and blood of his Saviour against his inclination : I would welcome him home again, scorned by authority, reprobated by tutors, blasted in his every worldly prospect, and see him beg his bread, rather than enforce his submission. It seems to me to be the very height of inconsistency, to treat a youth of 14, 15, or 16 years old, as competent on matriculation to swear his assent to the 39 Articles—and then when he comes up to reside, to subject him as an irresponsible being, to attend religious services to which he objects as aggravating the offences of youth. It is all very plausible to argue that these compulsory observances tell well afterwards : I never knew them do so, and it is notorious that directly men become their own masters by taking their degrees, they desist from chapel : and to me it seems corroborative evidence in favour of reform, that the authorities and tutors themselves rarely attend, but officially or in rotation : at least so it was in my day.—Besides, look at the effect all over the world of *insensuring the youthful mind with feelings of individual responsibility* :—take for instance, *our public schools* : I was at none of them, and therefore can be accused of no prejudice in their favour, while I confess some in respect of details against them. Now it is a fact beyond all controversy, that the boys who have the highest and truest sense of honour, are those who have been educated at our public schools.—(There are exceptions to

all rules ; I speak *en masse*.) Now why is this ? because much is trusted to their own sense of honour : and every mean action entails its penalty without the master's interference.—Let who will differ with me, the principles of the true gentleman, and the true Christian, are not very opposite—good manners are very nearly related to good principles, and though mists for awhile might perhaps obscure the horizon, the religious services of young men at the Universities, so long as they are received so late in life, cannot be too soon left to their own good sense, and the principles which they bring with them. The scorner and the infidel will shortly feel at the Universities, what meanness and blackguardism entail at public schools : alienation from all respectable associates.

I only trespass further upon your indulgence, reader, to add a few pages on the question of

THE REMOVAL OF OUR BISHOPS FROM THE HOUSE OF LORDS : and here I hope to shew that I am no party-man, carried about with every wind, no matter whither, so long as serves the movement. I leave to you to judge from what you already know of my opinions, to say how much *orange* bedecks my frontlet. On this present subject I beg at once to apprize you of my inconsistency, by saying,—

“ Its gude to be wise, to be honest, and true,
And bide by the bonnets of blue.”

And the deeper the shade on this subject, the more to my mind. My wish to renew my objections to the degradation of our episcopacy originates in my knowledge that such a cause is constantly engaging new allies, and allies too who call themselves “*conservatives of every thing that is good*.” Now as I am sure that SUCH CONSERVATISM *has a far greater tendency to democracy and universal equality in all things,* than many measures which conservatives distinguish by the

epithet "DESTRUCTIVE," and as I am also sure that nothing is more foreign to the wishes of those to whom I allude, than to contribute in any way to such ends, I should gladly have lent more of my aid to arrest such LIBERALISM in its mistaken course by exhibiting in my own sphere of action the question in its religious bearings: and however inadequate I might prove to the just fulfilment of such a task, I am confident that the subject I should have in hand, is capable of wonderful and *seasonable* improvement: and in at present declining it, contrary to my first intention, (merely because a pamphlet on ephemeral questions is its own enemy if too long) I sincerely hope that more able hands may take it up, and so at once banish all thoughts of my ever reverting to it. At present I relinquish the idea with pleasure: because had I now proceeded on it, I should not only have taken the Poor Law Bill as exemplifying at once the *pro's* and *con's* on the question, but also have been led into more determined opposition to the Bishops of London and Chester, which I sincerely trust some future explanation (I should say *retraction*) of the part they took, and furthered in favour of the *principles of that Law*, may render unnecessary in any one. THE BISHOP OF LONDON, with the concurrence of the BISHOP OF CHESTER, took the side of EXPEDIENCY: *the Bishop of Exeter took the principles of justice and wisdom, whether human or divine.* Now without wishing to write disrespectfully of the motives of any of the Commissioners or any members of Parliament—without, I hope, expressing myself offensively to Dr. Blomfield or Dr. Sumner; I surely may say that those Bishops appear to me to have betrayed the trust reposed in them as especial guardians of the church, and invested in them as peers, solely and only as ambassadors under the New Covenant, when they for one moment admitted, much more when in

the House of Lords, *they taught that in any matter relating to the internal economy of the country, the Commissioners* (the bishops themselves I believe being of the number) *were "not called upon to enter upon the question upon moral or religious considerations,"—considerations* which I should say ought to flow through every thought, word, and deed of the legislature, just as blood circulates through the whole body of animal life—*considerations* whose especial nurture I have ever thought that it was the first duty of our bishops in parliament to assist. I quote from the Morning Herald of July 29, 1834, and if Drs. Blomfield and Sumner will take the trouble to read the various speeches of the former regarding the Bill referred to, they cannot but see how exposed they stand *to suspicion and doubt*, from which they owe it to themselves, the public, and the clergy, to relieve themselves. *For if expediency is the leading principle on which they really intend to legislate*, (and from the quotation made this would appear *too true*) they surely do not hesitate unequivocally to let us know our enemies: and if such is not their intention, there can be no question about the course they ought to pursue at the very earliest opportunity, in order to obliterate an impression, which must be as painful to them as they now know it is general throughout the country. "*The law of a Christian country* (said the Bishop of London) *should be a transcript of the laws of God, and I sincerely wish that they were always so, but PRACTICALLY that could not be the case.* Whether or no these words are truly reported, I can conceive no bishop at peace with himself till he has either denied or retracted them, directed as they are, not merely against the letter, but against the principle and spirit of the wisdom of God: and as peers cannot be judged by proxy in another world, I have yet to learn what relief was afforded

to the bishops involved by the *liberal* offer of the then Lord Chancellor “*to share all the responsibility with them.*” If “*it was certainly a question of expediency,*” (as Lord Brougham said) then it was a question quite foreign to the objects for which the bishops sit in the House of Lords: if it was not (and my opinion is that never was a question so necessarily, so directly, or so extensively involving the *most sacred* “MORAL AND RELIGIOUS CONSIDERATIONS,”) then the Christian church at large may well feel injured and hurt by one bishop (with the concurrence of another) defying a third *to controvert the doctrine of EXPEDIENCY* by Scripture. I hope, perhaps against hope, when I say that I look forward to a reparation to the church on the parts of Drs. Blomfield and Sumner for ever sanctioning such doctrine: I have said enough to shew that the Poor Law Bill presents us with the *con's* on the question of our bishops remaining in Parliament: I shall now point out the direction in which I find the *pro's*: saying first that I hope I have not transgressed the bounds of courtesy, nor yet deserted those of firmness and *truth*: no one can regret more than I do when the ministry of the Word brings me in opposition to those, especially if heads, of the same house: but my motto for public and private peace, for individual, national, and ecclesiastical prosperity, as well as for the defence of personal character always is “*Obsta principiis*.” and seeing the seed of contention continually spreading its noxious fibres, I should feel that I was a partaker in the sin of favouring its growth, if in my “*high and heavenly calling as an ambassador in Christ's stead,*” I allowed any false delicacy to dissuade me from the part I am taking. No one, however insignificant his station, should in these days despair of effecting some little in the cause of reform, by “*speaking out*” in favour of her; and though I am not weak enough to imagine that the Bishop

of Exeter stands in need of encouragement from me, I yet am sanguine enough to believe that as drops increase the torrent, and every stream flows onward to the ocean, so every ally may help to establish truth, and *every man is bound to put out his talent however small at all risk to interest.* The Bishop of London opened one of his replies to Dr. Philpotts by saying, "*that his Right Rev. Brother took the POPULAR side of the question :*" with what justice, or good taste this was spoken, whether it was directed against the Bishop of Exeter's motives, or in condemnation of his opinion, every one is as qualified as I am to conjecture : to me it seems rather mal-apropos, considering the enormous majority of the House of Commons to which Dr. Philpotts was opposed : I however allude to it only to express my hope, that it is "*the popular side,*" for I am sure that it is *the right one*—and at the same time to ask if really the POPULAR, *how then not the EXPEDIENT, one ?* My fellow-Christians, you will do well to sift this question to the bottom.—The fact is simply that the proposal to abolish the responsibility of fathers to support their illegitimate children was confessedly against the will of the people—was confessedly to the exclusion of the precepts of morality and religion—for "*moral and religious considerations*" were disclaimed)—was confessedly at the expense of the principles of the Divine Law, was confessedly urged only on the ground of EXPEDIENCY : as if property could be at all secure but "*in the hearts of the people,*" as if it ever did or ever can prosper but under the favour and blessing of the Author whose law was not only first cast behind, but at all risks defied as not containing any Scripture fatal to the expediency of the law propounded.

" Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone

in the midst of the earth." "In mine ears, saith the Lord of Hosts, of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair without habitation."

Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen who survey
 The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay ;
 'Tis yours to judge how wide the limits stand
 Between a splendid and a happy land.
 Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
 Where wealth accumulates, and *rights decay*.
 Princes, and lords may flourish or may fade ;
 A breath can make them as a breath hath made ;
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroyed, can never be supply'd.
 A time there was, ere England's griefs began,
 When every rood of ground maintained its man :
 For him *light labour spread her wholesome store,*
 Just gave what life required, but gave no more :
 His best companions innocence, and health,
 And his best riches, ignorance of wealth.
 But times are alter'd :
 Heavens ! how unlike their Belgic sires of old,
 Rough, poor, content, ungovernably bold,
 Warmth in each heart, and freedom on each brow !
 How much unlike the sons of Britain now.

And why this change ? is not government a partaker in the cause : look to Ireland ! Where are the landlords of "the first gem of the sea ?" Where is the Poor Law for the Irish people ? perhaps in contemplation—and are we to judge the forthcoming law for one part of Britain, by that which has been enacted for another : or is it found *expedient* to keep up a see-saw of oppression : and as Ireland rises, that England should be made to fall. Cannot Ireland be judged without abridging rights in England ? am I to be told that people in the country know nothing at all about the "*rights of the people* : " or that a clergyman has no business to "*speak out*" in their de-

fence? is this the independence conferred by preferment? I value my benefice as the wages of a public servant; and look upon the established endowments as the best pledge the public can give or receive for a fearless, free, and uncompromising "*delivering of the whole counsel of God.*" If, as some of the Chapter of Durham dictate by the pen of their representative, a full, and untrunkling advocacy of reform is incompatible with a ministry in the Established Church, let authority do its worst: I seek not to retain the badge of clerical servility: I say that "*rights decay;*" and if to say this is forbidden to the clergy, I am ready to seek my bread where freedom is allowed. "*Rights decay.*"

O luxury, thou curst of heaven's decree,
 How ill exchanged are things like these for thee!
 How do thy potions with insidious joy,
 Diffuse their pleasure only to destroy;
 Kingdoms by thee, to sickly greatness grown,
 Boast of a florid vigour not their own:
 At every draught more large and large they grow,
 A bloated mass of rank unwieldy woe,
 Till sapp'd of strength and every part unsound,
 Down, down they sink and spread a ruin round.
 Even now the devastation is begun,
 And *half the business of destruction* done;
 Even now methinks as pondering here I stand,
 I see the rural virtues leave the land.

For "*rights decay:*" do I charge the Commissioners or the Parliament with evil motives in devising the new *Poor Law*, which would be far more properly called the *New Property Law*? No: I do not:—but I do suspect them of judicial blindness: and I do forewarn landed proprietors to beware, lest they themselves fall into the pit which is digged to protect them. For look at the possible sequel of this property law: is there any encouragement to industry or frugality

affixed to it? any clause recommending landlords never to let a cottage without "*a rood of land*"—any clause to secure, wherever possible, for the poor in towns, that so much of the land adjacent shall be let to the poor at a fair accommodation rent as will give all householders under a certain rent the option* of "*wholesome store by light labour spread?*" is there any promise, any *praise for them that do well*? No,

* Why not let the poor have this option? Why not compel landlords to this, or else to sell the land necessary for it to government? Is it because it would be a violation of the rights of landlords? It is done to make way for rail-roads and canals for the benefit of the rich, why then may it not be done to obtain land for the poor?—Is it because Parliament cannot vote grants for the purpose as circumstances require? This is done for foreign Missions, and foreign wars,—why then is it not expedient when the objects of grants are to give work to the poor,—to supply bread to the starving, and covering to the naked—to cherish peace, and establish freedom at home? Why may not grants be made to supply the only sufficient impediment to inebriety and love of change—to give the people a little diversity of work and some expanse of mind beyond the mill, the factory and its webs—to lead them to study nature itself, instead of driving them to revel in the sophistry and philosophy of ill-directed reason. The real policy for the security and prosperity of all property, is to identify the agricultural and commercial interests, by associating as much as possible the operatives of the latter in the labours and profits of the former.—Give them something to go back upon when work is scarce and slack: encourage weaving, spinning, &c. at home, and proprietorship at home.—A rood of corn, a cow in the field, a pig in the sty, a potatoe in the garden, a healthy instead of a wan looking family—

“Even the weaver boasts these things to scan,”

“And learns to venerate himself a man.”

It is now perhaps too late to say to our rulers "*Beware lest ye be spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit*;" we must now call upon them to

“Say, should the philosophic mind disdain
That good, which makes each humbler bosom vain?
Let school-taught pride dissemble all it can,
These little things are great to little man:
And wiser he, whose sympathetic mind,
Exults in all the good of all mankind.”

forsook, there is no redeeming attention to the poor of this sort : and why not ? because it would be an infringement on the existing rights of landlords—because Parliament has no power to interfere with these ? Whence then does it derive the power to abridge the “ *rights of the people* ? ” why does it not exhibit the same delicacy and respect for these ? “ *It is a question of expediency.* ” Be it so—how is the question decided ; by an appeal to numbers—by a majority of the two Houses of Parliament. It was so : and now look at the possible consequence—and if you are a candid reader unpledged to any ministry, unprejudiced to any party, you will agree with me that

“ Even now the devastation is begun
And half the business of destruction done.”

you will agree with me that no one act of the legislature can contribute more directly and abundantly to equality in all things, than this miscalled Poor Law, devised for the protection of property, not for the maintenance or employment, or encouragement of the poor. It is not the number of persons, whom this new enactment will at first oppress, which renders it dangerous to every existing institution : but it is *the principle which it has recognized as the primary motive in man* : the principle of expediency and self-interest—for suppose that it is at one fell swoop proposed to appropriate all the property, and destroy all the exclusive rights of civil corporations—What, let me ask, can the authors and supporters of this Poor Law reply ?—they may say it is *not expedient*.—But the proposers of destruction may reply, Parliament sets up numbers as the standard of right, and there is a majority in the country, who think it expedient that the dock revenues of Liverpool should be taken in part payment of taxes. It is no longer a question of justice, but “ *it is a question of expediency* : ”

how, let me ask, are such proposals as this ever to be put to silence, if the legislature sets the example of preferring expediency to "*the weightier matters of the law?*"

Again—this Poor Law is, in point of fact, "*A UNION of landed proprietors:*" for what? to employ the people on their estates? to knock down work-houses and build up or make comfortable cottages, and to arrange the law of settlement, in order to throw some weight, where in justice it ought to fall on trade—in order to make trade support the poor whom trade creates? No such thing:—it is "*a Union*" against the working classes—a *union* to say "go to find work, for if you remain on our estates, we shall no longer let you have cottages, but you must go to the workhouse;"—and are landlords so infatuated as to think that *this union* will be lost sight of, whenever it suits the "*equality*" party to bring it forward into view. It is not around the dwellings of the rich and noble where *destructives* will seek to graft their own schemes of expediency upon *such union*: no: here self-interest will check, not aggravate danger—but it is in our populous towns and districts, where every preacher of sedition finds auditors. Nor will agitation stop here: look to the effects of *this union* and *this property law* on estates where landlords never set their foot from one year's end to another: look to the feelings already in existence among the people who never know what a benefactor is—among the poor on chapter lands, and the distant estates of nobility and gentry, where no crumbs fall from the rich man's table to feed the fatherless and the widow, where tears of sympathy never flow to save the breaking heart. Who are to shield these from the workings and declamatory appeals of Tertullian orators in the day of future danger: what hold do landlords retain on their affections to make such poor as these proof against the suggestions of the rebellious, and dis-

contented: do they trust to the clergy? what can we say—the poor tell us, that it is now all the same to them under what constitution they live: they tell us now that they have no longer a law to appeal to—that even some of our bishops have thought fit to consign their rights to the discretion of commissioners. What can we say, how can we meet and assuage the cravings of self-interest; how can we baffle and defy the suggestions of expediency, when it is notoriously sanctioned as the leading principle by the King, the Parliament, and the Episcopacy? are we to call in the aid of the commissioners in preference to the Bible? I wish to put the subject only in a fair point of view, I have no occasion, and God knows no inclination to speak disrespectfully of any superior; but when we discuss public measures, public men must appear also. I yield not to the most strenuous advocate of the new law in believing the devotion, and anxiety of the present commissioners to “*do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with their God* :” it is, I repeat, the principle against which I protest; the principle of violating the laws of justice whenever a majority can be got together to effect it—and, since expediency has begun its march, let the opposites of poverty look to their rights and land-marks—and the opposite of the people beware of the consequences. The commissioners may for this generation do good, and property may prosper; but it will be the prosperity of fools, which is a snare in which they are taken—of a man, who finds it easy to raise money *when it is expedient*, and thinks not of the hour when it will not be convenient to repay—it will be the prosperity of Haman erecting the gallows for Mordecai. “A new broom sweeps clean;” but let the present and past state of the church declare the advantages of discretionary power: let any one study the his-

tory of DISPENSATION, and he will never advocate any thing but a LEX SCRIPTA : he will then, if he does not now, see the evils of speculating upon human strength, which has never yet developed itself. Why we are to presume commissioners better than the Archbishops of Canterbury, and trust power to irresponsible power, when we know the consequences, I leave to parliament to announce—"it is simply a question of expediency."

But, again : let us "turn to the prospect as it lies" in another direction—suppose at some distant day it is proposed as expedient to begin quite *de novo* : that all land shall be divided afresh, and every man have his share : who can plead for the existing rights of property ? neither the authors or abettors of the new Poor Law !—Why not ? because when it has been determined by the few, as expedient to take away the rights of the many, the converse will be too easily justified and effected.—The same principle will equally favour *the movement against all funded property* : it is easily shown and too readily acknowledged and felt that taxation is not agreeable to the multitude ; suppose the multitude vote it *expedient* to wipe off all old scores with a rub of the finger : who can gainsay, who can plead in the name of justice for the vested rights of fundholders ? *the new Poor Law* at once ensures silence ; it is a *precedent for destruction of existing rights*.

And not only is it a precedent against all landed and funded rights, but since two bishops (more for what I know) are recorded in the history of last year as unqualifiedly approving it, I will just call attention to the use of which it is capable *against the existing rights of the clergy*. Could my concealment of such possibilities serve any good end. no power should wring them from me, but the subtilty of the enemy far outstrips the penetration of friends, and

my catalogue is brief to that, which agitators are preparing for their own use, whenever the time may promise advantage from its production. Who is jealous of the existing interests of the clergy, and I am not? Who cries shame! shame! against all who call that Church Reform, which is to be effected by injustice, and I will not re-echo their cry? Who is warm on such subjects, and I burn not? But have not the Bishops of London and Chester put the gag upon our mouths? Has not the expediency of the new Poor Law at once broken our shield? It has: for where, I ask, is shewn any respect for "*the existing rights*" of the poor? where but in the hearts and principles of the commissioners: and what then, let me ask, will the Bishops of London and Chester say, if it should, by some change, so happen that the House of Commons ever votes it expedient to trust the administration of the ecclesiastical revenues to three lay-commissioners? What language would they find strong enough against SUCH A CHURCH LAW? Would their lordships concur in SUCH EXPEDIENCY? Who are to be the supreme court to settle possible difference? Would their lordships think the *existing interests* of pluralists and sinecurists, and absentees very secure under such a commission? Or suppose that the House of Commons was to select three parochial clergymen, instead of the three estates of the realm, to arrange matters, such as stipends, &c. between incumbents and curates, and invest such a commission with irresponsible power, what would their lordships say then? Or suppose that three clergymen had been appointed to this new Ecclesiastical Commission, instead of Peers, and Ministers, and Bishops to arrange the dioceses and episcopal Revenues, what would their lordships have said then? that "*it was simply a question of expediency*?" Would they then be satisfied that Lord Brougham should

*share the blame with them ? “ Existing interests ! ! ” are the Clergy alone to stand, the poor alone to fall ? **

* In the Morning Herald, of August 9, the Bishop of London is reported to have spoken as follows, against the proposed amendment of the bastardy clauses: “ *in conclusion he was happy to state that he had in this measure the concurrence of a Right Reverend Prelate, the mere mention of whose name would be sufficient to testify, that it had nothing in it contrary to the law of God, or opposed to the best feelings of humanity,—he meant the Bishop of Chester.* ”—The “ *hear, hear* ” which followed this conclusion, requires that opponents muster up a little moral courage, ere they declare their dissent to this: I will yield to no partizan of the new Poor Law in esteeming the purity of motives, and intentions of both the bishops, and all the commissioners, but I must beg permission to doubt the judgement of all, if they begin to preach the conformity of their measure to the law of God. Little as I have the honour of knowing the Bishop of Chester, I am sure that I am doing his lordship no more than justice, when I say, that if ever I saw one man, who more than others would deprecate implicit faith in his “ *ego dixi*,” he is that one. I therefore feel no scruples or fear whatever in avowing that I do not think either his name or his judgement conclusive of all difference: and I think that I am paying the Bishop of London no paltry compliment, when I refer him for the reasons of my objections to an evening lecture, which I had the good fortune to hear him deliver in St. Peter’s Church, Chester, before his translation to London. His text was from Acts xvii. 11. “ *These were noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so ;* ” whence, unless my memory deludes me, the bishop exhorted his auditors to imitate the example of the Bereans, who are approved for appealing from Paul’s “ *ipse dixit* ” to “ *the Law and the Testimony.* ” If we are to recognize the sufficiency of any one man to decide the conformity of this new law to the law of God, who is to select the oracle. The Bishop of London names the Bishop of Chester—I am not at all singular in esteeming the judgement of the Bishop of Exeter quite as sufficient—others may say, we will have nothing to do with any bishops—and may quote the then Lord Chancellor on one side, or Lord Wyndford on the other, who rising immediately after the Bishop of London had adduced the sufficiency of the Bishop of Chester, repelled that conclusion by plumply saying, “ *To visit the woman and not the man was inconsistent with justice, humanity, religion, and law.* ” How are these differences to be put an end to, if not by “ *Searching the Scriptures daily,*

"Calm is my soul, nor apt to rise in arms,
 Except when fast approaching danger warms :
 But when contending chiefs blockade the throne,
 Contracting regal power to stretch their own ;
 When I behold a factious band agree,
 To call it freedom when themselves are free,
 Each wanton judge new penal statutes draw,
*Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law : **

whether these things are so." I am sure that the Bishop of Chester will feel any thing rather than anger, when I confess myself a Protestant not only in name but in deed—thinking no man on earth infallible, and preferring "the law and the testimony" to the *dicta* of any. I can conceive no sophistry able to reconcile the bastardy clauses as proposed, with the conciliatory precepts of the Gospel, conformed "*to the Law of God, or the best feelings of humanity.*" Possessing the influence which the Bishop of Chester does, and quoted as he was by the Bishop of London, and made as the laws of bastardy now are, a point of Scripture doctrine he owes to the country, the church, and himself publicly, to retract or justify this apparent contradiction—and I for one promise both him and the Bishop of London to give to their arguments all the consideration which is due to their superior talents, and station, and what are above both, their accredited purity of motive, and integrity of intention. While thinking of the Bishop of London's Sermon on Acts xvii. 11, it occurs to me to recommend the votaries to expediency to read, and inwardly digest a sermon by that first-rate writer M. Le Bas, on Proverbs xvi. 6. "*By the fear of the Lord men depart from evil.*"

* "*Rich men rule the law.*"

I hope that landlords will forgive the honesty which would here add a caution to them to beware how they rule the law in respect to tithes, as well as the Poor Laws. Let it be remembered that in all exchanges, enclosures, &c., a condition, as the law now stands, is that the church have the advantage : let the rich beware how they rob the church of this. To argue because tithes or the present method of collecting them are unpopular, that therefore it is lawful or expedient to sell or buy them at less than their actual worth to the landlord after purchase, is to justify the usurer in watching for the temporary difficulties of a debtor to turn the occasion to his own advantage ; it is to give a premium to agitation which may some day be quoted against as well as in favour of landlords. Suppose a country gentleman invested with the trust of a neighbouring property for a minor, empowered to sell or exchange land at his own discretion ; suppose that this trustee were to avail himself of an oppor-

The wealth of climes, where savage nations roam,
 Pillaged from slaves, to purchase slaves at home.
 Fear, pity, justice, indignation start,
 Tear off reserve, and bare my swelling heart,
 Till half a patriot, half a coward grown,
 I fly from petty tyrants *to the throne.*"

tunity thus afforded to him to possess himself of a portion of land adjoining or intermixed with his own estates, which the ancestors of this minor had always retained, and valued as Naboth did the inheritance of his fathers. What, let me ask, would be thought of a trustee thus turning his trust to his own advantage: would he not immediately forfeit the respect and confidence of all who knew of the transaction. Parliament is entrusted with the management of tithes: let parliament, and landlords beware lest the parallel extends further. I need hardly say that the people are the ward, nor yet that those are false or mistaken friends to the people, who in any commutation favour either the landlord or the clergy at the ward's expense. The king ought to abdicate the throne, or die upon the scaffold, rather than become a party to unjust or partial legislation. Make the most of tithes as left for the spiritual good of the people. Let them be bought, sold or, commuted, according to the old law of giving the ward the advantage—the application of tithes is quite a distinct question. The avowed ulterior objects of many of those, who advocate that a bonus be allowed to landlords to tempt them to take what is called the *onus* of tithes upon themselves, might from its very plausibility arouse their watchfulness. To say nothing of the consequences of injustice in another world, I wish them too well ever to feel indifferent, when I see them consenting to their own future execution in this—when I see them cajoled and duped till they place their properties and characters in jeopardy by assisting and accelerating measures, which will as soon as effected, be quoted as specimens of their selfishness, and as flaws in their titles—which will be adduced at the very first opportunity to irritate the discontented against the upper classes, as exemplifying how under our present constitution "*rich men rule the law in their own favour.*" Let landlords beware: their turn of being governed may come perhaps sooner than they themselves expect, for as Blackwood's Magazine in its January number observes, in all revolutions the infatuation of the rich and great is the source of the greatest danger. They seem to say to themselves "*We can never be removed.*" God's arm however is not shortened, that it cannot strike injustice and oppression, as potently in the 19th century, as in all former ages of the world.

Yes, Fellow-Christian, "*I fly to the throne*," for the people's, and my sovereign's sake; why did Nathan say unto David, "*Thou art the man*,"—why did the Baptist admonish Herod—why did Paul reason before Felix, till the Governor trembled? For similar reasons—because it is appointed unto all men once to die and after that the judgement,—because so hardly shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of heaven,—because kings have their peculiar talents as well as the people—for the peoples and my sovereign's sake in this and another world, suffer me to ask—In whose reign has public evidence been afforded, that illegitimate children are justified in appealing to their reputed father for elevation to the ranks of the nobility? In the reign of WILLIAM THE FOURTH! During whose ministry? *that of EARL GREY!* Do I presume to judge the calling of a certain family to the peerage? no further, than to say, that till the Bishop of London propounded, "*It was sufficient to say that the difficulties of finding the father were almost insurmountable*," it seemed to me a natural desire on one part, and a natural expectation on the other: and consequently fatal to the argument that the new Poor Law is accordant to the law of nature. But I do presume to ask, and "*I write it for the king's good*," to induce, if possible, a timely preparation *against the Bighthans and Teresh's of our day, who seek to lay hand on the king Ahasuerus, and every institution which we value*,—I do presume to ask, was it a consistent act in the same deputy of this country to advise; was it a consistent act in the same king to approve, a law for the poor, which, however well-intended, was at once exonerating the reputed father from all liability; visiting the sins of the tempter on the victim; and placing the bastards of the poor beneath the consideration of the public? Are matters such as these

“*simply questions of expediency ?*” are these no source for “*moral and religious considerations ?*” then is the Christian’s faith vain, and our preaching is indeed vain also !” and all the thanks be to the bishops of London and Chester which may be due for this new lesson in EXPEDIENCY. Well might the Bishop of Exeter protest that he would not be one to say “*that we may do evil that good may come.*” There is more bitter fruit in this small bud than the agents themselves perceive : he, who sits by the wayside looking at objects as they pass with no other interest but what one stranger feels for another, may see the linch pin out when the traveller is laughing at the beggar’s insignificance : and it sometimes happens that the mates of the lower deck discover that the vessel is leaking, when the captain is poring over theories, instead of attending to practical navigation. I speak the words of truth and soberness, when I declare my perception of the consequences of the Poor Law. “*Even now the devastation is begun :*” I will yield to no man in love of my country, and her sacred institutions, nor yet in attachment to and anxious desire, to fulfil, as far as lieth in me, the holy commission which I hold,—but were my objects opposite, and my ends as false and treacherous as I feel them to be true and just ; I should wish no better topic than the new Poor Law, to excite the animosities and work upon the passions of the English people : and confident that it is available for such purposes, that there is not only plausible, but JUST grounds for popular dissatisfaction, I feel that I am only “*exercising myself to have a conscience void of offence towards God and towards man,*” by declaring in the most unreserved manner, the objections I entertain to it : and if my so doing entails upon me the disapprobation of the bishops or

any others with whom I differ, the day will come when crooked things shall be made straight, and I shall hope that my condemnation for "*speaking out*" *boldly*, as I hold that *every clergyman ought to speak*, will not extend beyond the days of a man, which after all are but as a span long, so soon passeth our life and trial away, and we are gone. It is after all on matters which involve the soul—and when we recollect that we are hereafter to render an account of *every idle word*, what matter does not involve the soul—it is after all "*but a small thing to be judged of man's judgment.*" *he that judgeth is the Lord.*" and *as many who are first shall be last, let us all where we think we stand, take heed lest we fall.*

"Be mine in this my hour of grace
Intent before my eyes to place,
The lot of him who sins :
And in my heart this truth to store
That when the day of grace is o'er
The day of wrath begins."

Unless expediency is henceforth to be tolerated as the ascendant principle in British Legislature, unless the precepts of the Divine Law are to become a dead letter, all men however humble, however obscure, much more the rich and great, owe it to their religious profession, to their children, and their children's children to make known their objections, and so give to their principles all the extent and perpetuity, and to their champion all the encouragement which co-operation and active union can give. Ere another barrier is attempted, we cannot, my fellow-Christians, make too early or too decided a stand to arrest the march of *expediency*.—It is a principle which renders every thing "*unstable as water.*" if a man is rich this year, the legislature may vote it expedient to make him poor in the

following year : it is a principle which if adopted by the rich, must be sanctioned also in the poor : and if self-interest in present things is to be countenanced as the first motive, who is to dictate to the people where expediency shall stop ; is not labour the source of wealth ? May not the labourer then say to the proprietor, you have taken from me all interest in the soil ? work it yourself—or if he goes on for awhile in his work, may he not in the hour of danger say, “you have changed the constitution of Great Britain : you have quite changed my relation in society : you have now made my home dependent on irresponsible men : you have taken from me all fixed interest in the soil : defend it yourselves : it is all the same to me under what form of government I now live : one master may be as good as another : and the poor have now no longer a law to appeal to.” Let landed proprietors beware ; there is no greater enemy to property than the indifference of inferiors. *Expediency is a principle which will perpetuate changes of ministry without end, ruinous to trade, ruinous to property, ruinous to public confidence, ruinous to every other principle, and dangerous to every bond and tie which man holds dear in life.* It is a principle (deny this who can) which places the throne at the mercy of every agitation, and renders the industry of the people the victim of every Parliaments’ caprice : it is a principle which will carry a minister no one knows where : which whoso follows, whether for civil or ecclesiastical government, will find himself like the dreamer who pursues the creation of his own disordered imagination as a shining light, till he finds himself sinking in the quagmire, or wakes to discover his delusion : it is a principle which whosoever adopts, whether for public or private affairs, will find himself likened to the traveller who

begins his journey with many a companion, with all the joy of hope and all the confidence of enterprize, but finds as he proceeds, "*As many men, so many minds ; as many interests, so many ways :*" he will find himself like some hero of the sea, who sails to seek what none have ever reached, and as he nears the pole, sees his crew dwindling into solitude, and at last sits him down in despair, while the blood of his own veins stagnates at its source—*expediency*, my fellow-Christians, is a principle which ever has and ever will remove man further, and further from "*the Sun of Righteousness*," till her warmth is no longer felt, and her light at last lost to his view.——But is it so with JUSTICE? * Does she hide herself from those who seek her out? Does she separate friends who commence their pilgrimage in safety under her wings? Does she bring property and the people into collision? Does she proclaim safety or prosperity to one by the degradation or injury of the other? Does she make one law for the rich and another for the poor? Does she exonerate the strong, and bring into subjection the weak? Does she tell us that woman was made for man, and man not responsible for the consequences? Does she say that the afflictions and visitations of Providence shall be increased by alienation from children, by estrangement from neighbours, by being carried away captive from their cottage to the house of *expedient* UNION? Does she visit poverty and misfortune as a crime, or place them at best unheard

* Let it here be observed that I take the principle of *justice* only : were I to appeal to mercy, faith, hope, or charity, I should be compelled to oppose myself still more unreservedly against the Bishops of London, and Chester : and I allow myself to hope that I have said enough to vindicate some part of the parochial clergy from interfering with Lord Brougham in his readiness to share all the blame with his coadjutors, if not enough to induce all three to reconsider, and reverse their judgement.

and unfriended at the bidding of strangers, instead of under the arm of the constitution?—No, my fellow-Christians, it is the exclusive privilege of EXPEDIENCY to do these things. “*Oh that my people would consider, saith the Lord,*”—every departure from justice is but the prelude of adversity : and never can the throne be esteemed secure, or property* be expected permanently to flourish, unless the people be governed with justice.—*Justice* is as the sun before us, when we approach it : it is as the sun at noon-day, in whose rays the wakeful shepherd basks upon the mountain side, contented and happy in his lot : and under whose genial warmth the wearied reaper sleeps secure “his hour of rest away,” ere he returns *with pleasure to his labour* : it is as the sun which ripens the corn of the rich, and dries up all tears of the poor—it is a principle which will make friends go where it will—which will baffle, and defeat the schemes, and ends of agitators : it will attach as fast as expediency will detach : it is as a standard, which needs but to be unfurled, and men will gather round it more and more until the perfect day : it is what the culprit can understand, and even the sentenced murderer will not gainsay—

* Those who agree in thinking the new Poor Law Bill capable of improvement, cannot but rejoice that it has been so repeatedly discussed during the late elections. The following extract from a speech by one of the members of the new parliament, is so creditable to the human heart, and leads me so gladly to look forward to the speaker's advocacy of revision of the Poor Law, that I cannot forbear to give it place here. “As a considerable owner of land, I beg to say that if agricultural relief can only be obtained by grinding the “faces of the poor, I want no such relief. The bastardy clause which visits on “the seduced the crime of the seducer, is so abhorrent to every good feeling, “that I am lost in astonishment, and cannot express the feelings of my indignant nation, that any number of Christian men could frame it, and mean to “carry it into execution.” Such sentiments do much, in my estimation, towards covering the sins of toryism.—I never can regard the speaker but as a better friend to the people, than the authors of the new Poor Law.

it is the only principle which can for any length of time render property prosperous or secure—the only one worthy of “*those to whom we are called upon to submit for the Lord's sake, whether it be the king, as supreme; or governors as them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well.*”

Whether or no justice can hold out against expediency in Great Britain, is yet to prove: may be wisdom and reform come too late: but let us try: while there is life there is hope: there must be a rallying place somewhere: and thanks, say I, to *the Bishop of Exeter for saying where it should begin*—thanks, say I, to him for availing himself of his elevation to the House of Lords, to prevent *the light being put under a bushel*, and to hold it up that all the country might see it: and whoever contemplates Dr. Philpotts' exertions as arguing in favour of continuing to the episcopacy, the privilege of sitting in the House of Lords, will see that it is not merely the Established Church, but every member of the Church of Christ, that is thereby represented: for I will not do any conscientious Dissenter the injustice to believe that his objections to any particular form of church government will in any manner interfere to diminish his joy, when “*the words of truth and soberness come forth to wrestle with principalities, and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places.*” It is as foreign to my purpose as it is to my nature to flatter any man: and I may leave to the expression of my opinion in favour of opening our universities to acquit me of any servile confidence in the Bishop of Exeter: I write in gratitude to Superior Power, not in adulation of human instruments; and as a believer *that the fear of the Lord is the only fountain of life, and that in Him alone can be any confidence*, I entreat my reader if ever this country is again blessed with the bond of peace,

and unity of spirit, to look back and see when the tide turned: in my humble judgement it has turned,—an irresistible discontent is rising on all sides *against expediency as the first principle of British legislation.*—Yes, fellow-countrymen, here, I believe, is “*a re-action,*” if you like to say so. Here, I believe, the tide is turning, if not already turned; not to restore tories to the exclusion of whigs, but to overthrow all *parties* by the irresistible waters of *principle*. Every one knows what is meant by the “*march of intellect:*” it may or may not be true that religion has been retreating before it: for my own part I think nothing of the kind; I believe that the sober-judging part of the community has been remaining inactive, only to gain strength from seasonable patience, and render their struggle more decisive when the hour of their trial arrived. That hour is now I firmly believe approaching, if not already come. “*The tide has turned,*” and though it may for the correction, and chastisement of rulers be ordained that the powers on earth shall be shaken, or even that some shall perhaps pass away, if they are infatuated enough to attempt to stop the flowing sea, yet I, for one, feel no desponding of spirit, for I believe that *all things*, even the hostility of enemies, and the bigotry of pretending friends “*are working together for good to them that love God.*” I, for one, think, or (if you prefer,) *imagine* that there is coming forth either from its hiding-place or its cradle a spirit, like the spirit of the Reformation, which will never rest or fail till government answers the ends for which rulers were originally ordained: the ministry of good to the governed—I, for one, perceive, or (if you will,) *imagine* a spirit, now gradually beginning to “*speak out,*” which will eventually develope itself into a sound practical religious active principle, equally removed from the cold formalities of mere *Protestant Churchman-*

ship, and from the wild dogmas of religious theorists—a spirit as distinct from the vain “*say, and do not*” of Solifidianism, as it is opposed to the no less unscriptural doctrine of Supererogation—a spirit as Protestant against the insane declamations, and delusions of fanaticism, as it is against the unconsolatory and groundless pretensions of human sufficiency—a spirit which will strive to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men, abounding in our day, and, alas ! in our church, who seem to strive in contention, which can most loudly contradict the Scripture that “*godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, as well as that which is to come :*”—“*of foolish men*” who “*minister questions which edify not,*” decrying all scientific pursuits as unfitted for the candidate for an incorruptible crown,—who go about telling their hearers that *persecution* is the test of rectitude and *sainthood*, seeming almost to look upon the natural consequences of their own irregularities as the seal of their own redemption :—“*of foolish men*” who seem never so happy as when they forget themselves, and throwing away all “*the milk of the word*” strive to obliterate from the memories of their gaping audience, if not from the pages of the Written Word “*that the ways of godliness are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace :*” “*that God’s ways are equal, and our ways unequal :*” that our heavenly Master saith, “*my yoke is easy and my burden light.*” If it be God’s good will that this country is to be exalted higher than ever, if it is not to be delivered for a while to the Philistines, and we are yet to be spared the sorrow of seeing the abuses of our Ascendancy visited by the fall of our ark into the hands of our enemies, our Reformation must be effected by some human means ; and whether or no the *Bishop of Exeter* is to be the pilot chosen of God, under whom we are to weather the storm, it is in the power of no man to foresee : but it is in the

power, and it is the bounden duty of all to look back, and certain it is that *he* has planted the bright banners of truth and justice in a stronghold, whence, I, for one, *for the people's sake* pray that *our bishops, and least of all the Bishop of Exeter may never be removed.* Yes, fellow-countrymen, "*for the people's sake,*" I pray this. It may indeed be said, that the Bishop of Exeter is not liberal in his political principles, that he was opposed to the Reform Bill; I have nothing to do with that bill; it is the law of England, and all I say of it is, may it prove a source of good to us all. But if any say, "that the Bishop of Exeter is not a reformer, that he is not a friend to the people and their rights," let them not count me as agreeing to their opinion: for my observation leads me to say, that I think him the only bishop who has evinced a friendliness to true reform, the only bishop who has evinced friendship for the people. Do I only say, look for proof of this to his conduct on the passing of the Poor Law?—No: I say more, I say look to him as a Diocesan: I say read his Charge to his clergy, in 1833. Do you there find any timeserving *expediency*? any shiftiness of opinion?—No: you find a plain, manly, straightforward declaration of views, which at once disarms even opponents of their hostile prejudices.—While other dignitaries in the church are *charging against "reform in the proper sense of the word"*—are compassing heaven and earth to retain one friend to our corrupt and baneful system of sinecures and pluralities, contradicting their words by their practice—while others are thundering out their *anathemas and high-church dogmas* against men whose only crime is that they choose to judge for themselves—while others are attempting to give the colour of plausibility by instancing this and that man as tempted by the golden stalls of Durham to literary pursuit which I for one had vainly thought brought to the

learned its own reward, in the simple satisfaction of thirst for knowledge :—while the cry is raised in corners far and near that tithes are the property of the clergy—who said nearly two years ago, that they were the property of the people, entrusted to the state, for the religious good of the people? Who has ever shewn that his heart is bound up with tithes as the great link between the rich and poor, between property and the people? Who has ever manifested his opinion that the clergy are not to be regarded as possessors, but as servants for life—servants bound to supply a certain quantity of certain wholesome food to all who will receive it at their hands—servants responsible both in this world and another, that they supply the bread of life according to their contract, unadulterated by their own nostrums, and unleavened with the poison of sectarianism? Who has, as it were, challenged the whole country to fair, free, candid, and honourable discussion, and consideration of the application of the ecclesiastical revenues? *Who has done one and all these things, but the present Bishop of Exeter?* yea, more than all these things, who has declared the question of the application of those revenues as open on all sides but one—viz. the appropriation of them for secular and civil purposes? *the Bishop of Exeter!!* and is this man an enemy to reform? is this man no friend to the people?—but far be it from me to ask any man to place implicit confidence in my assertions: all persons can construe the following extract from the Bishop of Exeter's Charge, in 1833, as well, perhaps better than I can. For this reason, and to prevent any misunderstanding consequent upon my interpretation, I submit the whole paragraph from the forty-first page of the Charge.

“And here I must take leave to repeat with reference to Church
 “Reform, what I have already said in reference to other matters,

“the very obvious truth, which, however, is not always borne in mind by those who speak and write on this subject, that the principle on which such reform ought to be conducted is—regard to the best method of making the institutions and the revenues of the church as available as possible to the preservation and extension of the knowledge of true religion, and to the edification of the people,—not the best and most satisfactory mode of remunerating the ministers of the church, highly interesting as that object must be felt to be.”

What other bishop, what other peer, what commoner has ever said or seconded this? which of them have ever met the question of Church Reform on this principle? none of whom I know: and yet it is a principle wide, and liberal enough to please any but *the destructives* of religious endowments.

Reform is in an infant state; but if the king, and his ministers have seen the error of their ways, and are about to become the nursing fathers of justice, our prosperity will go on from strength to strength. We never have yet seen a ministry who have not fallen by its own weakness;* we never have yet seen one try *the strength of principle* against the strength of party. Some readers

* How true is this of the late ministry—to conciliate one party, they attempted a commutation of church rates, adding the appearance of deception to the impolicy of making the charge a national, instead of a local burden: and what was the consequence? their supporters, the Dissenters, ridiculed their *expediency*! what then? the bill was laid aside, and to recover the strength they had lost, instead of boldly hazarding their places by a trial of justice, they deferred the question of appropriating for state purposes the revenues of the Irish church, by devising an unnecessary commission? and what was the consequence of this *expediency*? what is sure to be the case again as long as *expediency* is the governing principle: the cabinet itself went to pieces, and shortly after died a natural death. “*Not leaning to any party is the surest way to please all parties.*” Have we now a minister who will try this? he will, at least, have the recommendation of being a new character in British history.

may laugh at what I write, with the same sneer of derision with which the favorite of the king answered Elisha when the prophet foretold of plenty ; “ *behold, if the Lord would make windows in heaven, might this thing be ?* ” let scoffers remember the fate of that lord ; my observation suggests to me to ask (and my confidence does not fail when I do ask) the reflecting portion of my readers to consider, if ever we do attain unity, whether it may not be traced to him, as a blessed instrument in the economy of Providence, who a few years ago was the chief object of general obloquy. I know the prejudices which exist against the *Bishop of Exeter*—that some object to him as guilty of inconsistency on *one* particular subject : I take not upon myself to criticise his vindication of himself ; but to all his accusers, be they whom they may, in these days when men are carried backward and forward with every breeze, I will say “ let him that is without the sin of inconsistency *upon several* subjects throw the first stone.”—I know again that they are many, very many, who object to the Bishop of Exeter, as manifesting too little of (what I know not how better to describe than by saying) *that which they themselves discern so much more abundant in bishops of their own PARTY*. I know that one says “ *I am of Paul,* ” another, “ *I am of Apollos :* ” a third, “ *I am of Cephas,* ” and would to God that such divisions were more unequivocally condemned by the various objects of preference. For myself, I am not, and trust I never shall be a *party* man : I see the evils of it in the state, and in society, and have known too much of it *in the church*, ever to cease lamenting its effects, or striving to withstand its influence. “ *No one knoweth the spirit of a man, save the spirit which is in him :* ” and I never feel the least disposition to judge any man, save by

his works : men are called upon to "*shew their faith by their works*," and I therefore assume that liberty, which all others exercise, of forming my own opinions of public men by their public conduct.

"Here's freedom to him that would read,

"Here's freedom to him that would write,

"There's none ever fear'd that the truth should be heard,

"But those whom the truth would indite :"

and as that spirituality is at best "*of dubious extent*" which sanctions *expediency* before the dictates of natural justice, and *the principle of the Divine Law*,—as that heart is to my judgement but partiality or doubtfully regenerate, which postpones humanity to prudence, conciliation to hardship, mercy to severity, and sanctions the sacrifice of poverty to property, I for one, in the face of every party, in defiance of every prejudice, and careless whether enmity or amity result to myself, boldly avow my anticipation, that *if ever the Church of England lives again in the hearts of the British people,—if ever the day returns when they look upon her altars as the outposts of toleration, and her ministers as watchmen on the tower,—if ever a liberal reformation is effected, and our diseased constitution purged of its corruptions—if ever expediency, the tyrant of the world is deposed, and justice, once the boast of British government restored to supremacy (and God grant that we may all see these things brought to pass !)*—then, if not before, it will be seen that *the tide in our affairs turned, that the resumption of right principles by the legislature commenced, with the manful and Apostolic stand with which the Bishop of Exeter raised the banners of Divine wisdom in the House of Lords,—when, with Spartan courage he buckled on the whole armour of God, and with the sword of the spirit, and the shield of faith stood almost alone in the pass between injustice and*

the people :—*then, if not before, will he who runs read the advantages gained, not for the church alone, (it is as dust in the balance on such a subject !) but for Christianity, for civil and religious liberty, yea, even for cold and calculating Deism, yea, for mere philanthropy, by THE CONTINUANCE OF OUR BISHOPS IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.* No one wishes less than myself that “*Lord, Lord,*” should be heard constantly re-echoing in the Houses of Parliament: in an arena where great warmth of debate is inevitable, and freedom of discussion of manifest advantage, I can conceive nothing more prejudicial to the interests of pure and undefiled religion : but he is no well-wisher to his country, who does not wish to see “*truth and justice meet together there, and righteousness and mercy kissing each other ;*” he is no friend to peace or concord who does not wish to see *the principles* of the Divine Lawgiving infused into all British legislation : who is indifferent to the activity of the influence of that Law written in the heart of man—and who does not desire to perceive the still small voice of conscience dictating in secret silence to every member of our legislature, that to build upon expediency is to build upon sand, where every breeze shall shake, and every storm destroy the edifice,—while to take counsel from Divine Revelation, and *principles* from Infinite Wisdom, is to build upon the rock, where all will dwell with safety, and whence the waters of prosperity will abundantly and incessantly flow to all the valley beneath. It is the trial of this generation to adopt the upward road of righteousness, as alone exalting the nation, or to follow the discontented on the easy downward road of expediency—and as I am never above hearing truth from an enemy, and ever, I trust, disposed to make the most of agreement, I know not how I can better bring my Address to an end than by saying, in

the words of Mr. Howitt, "on this age the happiness of centuries, the prosperity of truth depends: let it not disappoint the expectations, and mar the destinies of millions," unless, indeed, I may be permitted to direct my reader's thoughts to the means, as well as the end, by adding, the words of wisdom and experience, "blessed is the man whose delight is in the Law of the Lord; who in his law will exercise himself day and night. He shall be like a tree planted by the water-side, that will bring forth his fruit in due season. His leaf shall not wither, and look whatsoever he doeth it shall prosper." "O that our ways may be made so direct, that we may keep the statutes of the Lord! so shall we not be confounded, while we have respect unto all his commandments."

POSTSCRIPT.

HAVING on the subject of *Convocation* alluded to the Bishop of London's recommendation to his Clergy, to refer to "*Certain Letters, by L. S. E.*" I feel a pleasure in giving the same publicity to his Lordship's most exemplary omission of the same in the 2nd Edition of his Charge, of which I was not aware till last Saturday, when it was out of my power to erase the allusion. I am sure that his Lordship, if he cares about my observations at all, will admit my excuse; and while I rejoice in an approximation of opinion on one subject, he will pardon me for cherishing a lurking hope that he will extend his reconsideration to others, "see truth's full force, and yield to reason's sway" on them as he has with regard to "*Certain Letters.*"

Feb. 16, 1835.

(Thomas Wilson and Sons, High-Ousegate, York.)



